

THE  
**CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.**  
*New Series.*

VOL. I.]

MAY, 1827.

[No. V.]

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

WHEN DOES THE SABBATH BEGIN?

THE question when the Sabbath begins, or whether Saturday or Sabbath evening belongs to the Sabbath, is a question of no little importance. The difference of opinion and practice among professing Christians as to the time when the Sabbath begins, doubtless has influence in weakening in the minds of people, a reverence for that sacred day. They observe professors conversing about the world, and attending to their secular concerns on both Saturday and Sabbath evenings. And those who observe different evenings will interrupt each other in their devotions and lead one another into worldly conversation, and insensibly lessen their respect for the holy Sabbath.—How desirable then that there should be, in this respect, an agreement. And is there not sufficient light on the subject in the scriptures to settle the question, if examined carefully and impartially? There are three passages in the Bible which are generally adduced to prove that Saturday evening belongs to the Sabbath. And though doctrines and duties are usually taught in more numerous places; yet, if these three are explicit and unequivocal, they ought to decide the point. But, if it is doubtful whether they do afford the supposed proof, and there are many more passages, which seem to teach that the evening following the day be-

ongs to the Sabbath, then every one, who wishes to take the Bible as the standard of his faith and practice, will carefully compare these passages together, and candidly enquire which afford the greater weight of evidence?

The first argument in favor of observing Saturday evening as holy time is drawn from Gen. i. 5, &c. "The evening and the morning were the first day." As the evening is mentioned first, it is inferred that the day began with the evening preceding, and included the night and the following day; though in this same verse the day is mentioned before the night. "God called the light day, and the darkness he called night." And therefore according to this mode of reasoning, we might infer that the day preceded the night. The evening and morning include twenty-four hours.—Consequently, if the evening began at sunset, it must have extended to sunrise, and the morning from sunrise to sunset. But it is contrary to scripture and universal practice to call the time from midnight to sunrise *evening*, and from noon to sunset *morning*. The time before sunrise is often called morning. See Gen. xix. 15, 23, 27. Ex. xii. 29—33, 42, compared with verse 22. Ex. xiv. 24. Ruth iii. 14. 1 Sam. xxv. 22, 34. Ps. cxix. 147. Dan. vi. 19. Mark i. 35. But if the evening begins the day and extends to sunrise, then the time before sunrise is not morning, but

evening. As the evening is the close of the day, there could be no evening before there was a day. And the evening succeeding the day, properly belongs to the day; and is so reckoned in the scriptures, as I shall presently show.

If in Gen. i. 5, it had been said the morning and the evening were the first day, I presume no one would have thought of beginning the day at sunrise, and extending the morning to sunset, and then extending the evening from sunset to sunrise. But they would have considered the day as beginning at midnight, and the morning as extending from midnight to noon; and the evening as extending from noon to midnight, as we all reckon. All call the time from midnight to noon *morning*, and from noon to midnight *evening*.—And how much stress ought to be laid on the mentioning of the evening first, when the order of time is often inverted in the scriptures? It is said that Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth. And Japheth was the elder; and Ham the younger; Gen. v. 32, and ix. 24, and x. 31. In Acts v. 30, and x. 39 it is said, the Jews slew Christ, and hanged him on a tree, which according to this argument would prove that they slew him before they hung him on the cross. 2 Tim. i. 9, "Who hath saved us and called us." Here salvation is put before effectual calling or regeneration. Jude verse 1—sanctified—preserved in Jesus Christ, and called. Here sanctification is put before regeneration. In 1 Cor. vi. 11, sanctification is mentioned before justification. Upon which Dr. Scott remarks, "the arrangement of the expression in the 11th verse shows that no argument can be drawn *merely* from that circumstance in respect to controverted points of doctrine." If this remark be correct, then no argument in favour of keeping Saturday eve-

ning can be drawn from the circumstance that in Gen. i. 5, the evening is mentioned first.

2. Lev. xxiii. 32, "From even to even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath," is adduced to prove that the weekly Sabbath begins at sunset, though it has no reference to the weekly Sabbath, which is enjoined verse 3d, but to the great day of atonement. But if one evening only is here included, which is it? Does *from* one include that, any more than *to* the other includes that? In this chapter several solemn feasts are enjoined, which are called Sabbaths. And as the time for celebrating none except this is thus mentioned, does it not seem to imply that the appointed time was peculiar to this? As if it had been said, "from even to even shall ye celebrate this Sabbath." As the day of atonement was a peculiarly solemn day, in which the people were to "afflict their souls," it is probable that both evenings were observed, which is the opinion of some commentators, who say that it was kept from sunset to midnight of the next day. That both evenings were included appears from similar expressions in this chapter and other places. In verses 15 and 16, the children of Israel were directed to count *from* the morrow after the Sabbath seven Sabbaths complete, even *into* the morrow after the seventh Sabbath—fifty days. Now unless both of these morrows be included it will not make fifty days. Ex. xii. 15, "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread;—from the first day *until* the seventh day. Here both days are included to make the seven days. In verse 11th, *until* the fourteenth day included that day; because the paschal lamb was killed and eaten on the evening following the fourteenth day, as I shall show beyond all doubt. In verse 18th *until* the one and twentieth day includes that day. And in Lev. xxiii. 32, the very verse

containing the supposed argument which we are examining, the evening *preceding* the tenth day is called the evening of the *ninth* day. The Israelites were to celebrate the tenth day as the day of atonement; but were to begin on the evening of the *ninth* day and keep the evening of the ninth day, and the following day. So that this affords no evidence that the weekly Sabbath begins Saturday evening.

3. It is urged that the Jews brought their sick to Christ to be healed when the sun was set Sabbath evening, because they considered it unlawful to heal on the Sabbath, and because the Sabbath ended at sunset. See Matt. viii. 5—18. Mark i. 21—34. There is however no intimation that they viewed it unlawful to heal on the Sabbath, but the contrary, and no intimation that they brought their sick when the sun was set, because the Sabbath was ended; but it is a mere assumption. He had cast out an unclean spirit, and healed two that day, viz. the centurion's servant and Peter's wife's mother, both by request, and the servant, by the urgent entreaties of the elders of the Jews, (Luke vii. 3, 4,) and without any complaint from any one. On the contrary they spread abroad his fame. But did they spread abroad his fame for breaking the Sabbath? That the Scribes and Pharisees and chief priests did not view his healing on the Sabbath a breach of the Sabbath, is manifest, notwithstanding their malignant cavils. For by his reply he put them to shame, Luke xiii. 10—17. The breach of the Sabbath was death. Ex. xxxi. 15. And if they had believed that Christ broke the Sabbath by healing on it, they need not have sought false witnesses to put him to death. For they could easily have proved that he healed on the Sabbath. Why then did they wait till the sun was set before they brought their sick at Capernaum? I answer, to

avoid the intense heat of the sun, which Jahn in his *Archæology* says, is often very oppressive. Mr. Goodell, one of our missionaries in Palestine, to avoid suffering from the heat, "took care to keep himself quiet and within doors from sunrise to sunset." And they left their lodgings "in the evening, travelling all night to avoid the heat of the sun." Now, if the last clause containing the reason of their travelling in the evening and night, had been omitted and only the fact had been stated, as it is respecting the Jews' bringing their sick to Christ when the sun was set, might it not be urged that it was the Sabbath and they kept Saturday evening and would not travel till the evening was come, and the Sabbath ended? But if our missionaries in the same country travelled in the evening out of regard to their comfort, is it not reasonable to suppose the Jews brought their sick to Christ out of regard to their comfort?

4. It is urged that the Jews observed the evening preceding the Sabbath as belonging to the Sabbath. What was their practice while they were God's professing people, we must learn from the scriptures. And since their rejection, awful blindness and wickedness and disbelief of the New Testament, it little concerns us, in deciding upon the institutions of our holy religion, to know what their opinion and practice have been in their dispersed and unbelieving state. But

5. It is said that most commentators admit that the Jews kept the evening preceding the Sabbath as a holy time.

I was once of the same opinion. And I founded it upon the passages, which I have been examining. And others have done the same. But I am now willing to submit it to the candid and judicious, to decide whether these passages do afford evidence that the Jews observed



ved the evening preceding as belonging to the Sabbath. The learned Pool in his Synopsis, says, "As the Jews extended the preceding day to *midnight*, so they began the morning of the following day at *midnight*."

I will now adduce direct proof that the evening *succeeding*, and not the *preceding*, belonged to the Sabbath.

1. God expressly teaches that the evening *succeeding* the day belongs to the day. If the Sabbath began at sunset, then every other day began at the same hour, and the evening preceding always belonged to the day. But we shall find that God reckoned the evening following the day as belonging to the day. The day of atonement was to be observed on the tenth day of the month, Lev. xxiii. 27. But the evening preceding is called the evening of the *ninth* day, verse 32. But if the day had begun at sunset, the evening would have belonged to the *tenth* day. The children of Israel were commanded to kill the paschal lamb "at the going down of the sun," and to "eat it on the fourteenth day of the same month" at even, and to eat unleavened bread seven days unto the one and twentieth day at even—Deut. xvi. 6. Ex. xii. 6, viii. 18. Lev. xxiii. 5, 6. But if the fourteenth day began at sunset, then the evening would be the evening following the thirteenth day, and the first day of unleavened bread would be the fourteenth day. But it was the fifteenth day—Lev. xxiii. 6. Num. xxviii. 17. Hence the evening following the fourteenth and twenty-first day is called the evening of the fourteenth and twenty-first day.

The children of Israel went out of Egypt on the morrow after the passover, which would have been on the fourteenth day, if the fourteenth day had begun at sunset, and they had eaten the passover on the evening following the thirteenth

day. But in Num. xxxiii. 3, it is said they left Egypt "on the *fifteenth* day of the first month: on the morrow after the passover." Thus manifest is it that God even when speaking of solemn feasts, reckoned the evening *following* the day as belonging to the day. And in 1 Sam. xxx. 17, the Holy Spirit calls the evening *following* the day the evening of the day. "And David smote them from the twilight even unto the evening of the next day." Hence as God reckons the evening *following* the day as belonging to the day, and as I can nowhere find a different reckoning, I feel safe in inferring that the evening following the day belongs to the Sabbath. It would be truly unaccountable, if the evening *preceding* the day belonged to the day, that God himself should not reckon so, but should call the evening *following* the day the evening of the day.

2. In Nehem. xiii. 16—19, we find that to prevent the profanation of the Sabbath by the sale of fish, &c. by the men of Tyre, "when the gates began to be dark before the Sabbath, Nehemiah commanded that the gates should be shut." As they were not shut till it began to be *dark* they were not shut *before* the Sabbath, if the Sabbath began at sunset. And yet it is said they were shut before the Sabbath. And undoubtedly such a zealous reformer as Nehemiah would command the work of shutting the gates to be done *before* and not *after* the Sabbath began. If it be inquired why the gates were shut at dark if the Sabbath did not begin till midnight, I answer, had the Syrians been permitted to enter after dark, they could not have sold their wares that night, and would have lodged in the city, and sold them on the Sabbath, and the evil, which Nehemiah designed to remedy, would still exist.

3. In Matt. xxvi. 17, and Mark



xiv. 12, the fourteenth day of the month is called the *first* day of unleavened bread, which it could not be if it ended at sunset. The passover was to be eaten in the evening of the fourteenth day of the month. And no leavened bread was to be eaten afterwards for seven days—Ex. xii. 15, 18. The fifteenth day was therefore properly the *first* day of unleavened bread, Lev. xxiii. 6. Numb. xxviii. 17. But as they began to eat unleavened bread after, or with the passover, Ex. xii. 8, that evening, if the fifteenth day did not begin till midnight, was a part of the fourteenth day. Hence the fourteenth day might be called the *first* day of unleavened bread. But if the fourteenth day, on the evening of which the passover was eaten, ended at sunset, it could not with any propriety be called the *first* day of unleavened bread, because unleavened bread was not eaten until the beginning of the fifteenth day. And yet Matthew and Mark both call the fourteenth day, the *first* day of unleavened bread. As therefore unleavened bread was first eaten in the evening *following* the fourteenth day, they manifestly reckoned that evening as belonging to the fourteenth day. Luke says it was the day “in which the passover must be killed.” But as it was killed in the evening, it was not in that day if it ended at sunset.

4. The account of the burial of Christ furnishes evidence that the Sabbath did not begin at sunset. It was in the evening when his body was put in the tomb. For “the evening was come when Joseph went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus.” The evening here could not mean the first evening which began at noon, but the second, which began at sunset. For 1. Jesus had been *παλαι*, a long time dead, though he did not expire till after three o’clock, Mark xv. 44. That this is the meaning of *παλαι*,

see Matt. xi. 21, Luke x. 13, 2 Pet. ii. 3. 2. The expression, “when the even was come,” Matt. xxvii. 57, and Mark xv. 42, in other places means at or after sunset, Matt. vii. 15, compared with Mark i. 32. Matt. xx. 8, ix. 12. Matt. xxvi. 20, compared with Deut. xvi. 6, and John vi. 16, 17. 3. The evening generally means at or after sunset. Josh. x. 26, 27. 2 Chron. xviii. 34. Ezek. xii. 7. Ps. civ. 23. 4. Those who hold that the Sabbath begins at sunset, say that in Gen. i. 5, Lev. xxiii. 32, Matt. viii. 19, and Mark i. 32, the evening means sunset. 5. If the expression, “when the even was come,” does not mean the second evening or sunset, no one can tell what it does mean, or what time had come.

It is therefore manifest, that it was sunset when Joseph “took the body of Jesus.” And then he and Nicodemus, having “a mixture of myrrh and aloes about an hundred pounds weight,” embalmed the body “as the manner of the Jews was to bury,” John xix. 39, 40; which must have taken a considerable time. And as it was full moon, it was sufficiently light to do all they did, without inconvenience. And after the body was put in the tomb “the women which came with him from Galilee and beheld how the body was laid, returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment.” Can any believe that it was not after sunset when they had prepared their spices and ointments? And yet, after they had done this, they “rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment,” which required that no work should be done on the Sabbath. And therefore the Sabbath did not begin at sunset. And if it had begun at sunset, Christ’s prediction must have failed that he should be three days and three nights or a part of three days (according to the Jews’ man-

ner of reckoning,) in the heart of the earth or in the tomb. For being buried after the Jewish Sabbath began, and rising the next day, he was in the tomb only a part of *two* days. But if the day began at midnight, then he was in the earth according to the prediction, three days and three nights, or a part of three days. For he was buried on Friday evening before the Jewish Sabbath, and was all the next day or Saturday and a part of the first day of the week in the earth, or tomb. And this, I conceive, is absolutely conclusive. And the only way any evade the force of this argument is by denying contrary to all evidence, that Christ was buried before sunset.

5. The Apostles and primitive Christians met for religious worship on the evening succeeding, and not preceding, the first day of the week, and that evening was called the first day of the week. "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst." John xx. 19. This was the evening *succeeding* the first day of the week or Christian Sabbath. And yet it belonged to the first day of the week, or the Sabbath. For the *same day* at evening, being the first day of the week, means the same as the evening of the first day of the week. Consequently, the day had not then ended. At evening *οὐρανὸς ὡς*, it being evening implies that it was in the evening. It was "toward evening, and the day was far spent," when the two disciples, going to Emmaus, arrived there. And they stopped and took supper, and then walked back seven miles to Jerusalem, which probably took as much as two hours. And Christ did not appear to the disciples till after they had returned and "told what things were done in the way, and how he was known to them in

the breaking of bread," when the evening must have been considerably advanced. And yet the first day of the week, or Christian Sabbath, had not then ended, but it was the first day of the week, Luke xxiv. 13, xxix. 36. The primitive Christians used to partake of the Lord's Supper every Sabbath. And when Paul came to Troas, he tarried there seven days, till the first day of the week. And when the disciples came together on the first day of the week to break bread, or celebrate the Lord's Supper, Paul preached to them in the evening of that day, and administered the holy supper. Scott supposes that to accommodate Christian servants, who had heathen masters, they met in the evening. But as it was their custom to celebrate the Lord's Supper on the *Sabbath*, if they considered the evening preceding, as belonging to the Sabbath, why did they not meet on that evening? Why did Paul wait till after the Sabbath was ended, before he began the solemn services? That it was really evening when he began, appears from the fact, that "there were many lights in the chamber, where they were gathered together." Hence as they used to celebrate the Lord's Supper on the Sabbath, and as they met the evening succeeding, and not preceding, the Sabbath, to celebrate it, we infer that they considered the evening succeeding as belonging to the Sabbath.

6. It is more convenient, and better calculated to promote the spiritual good of men, to observe as holy time, the evening succeeding the day. It is often impossible for those who keep Saturday evening, to know when their Sabbath begins. When it is cloudy, and they have not time-pieces (and these vary) they may not know within an hour, when the sun sets. How then will they know when to leave their work, and begin their Sabbath.

Often they cannot get their work out of the way by sunset. When on a journey, they may not be able to get home by that time. When getting in their hay and grain, they may be hindered by showers and otherwise so as to be detained at work till after sunset, and thus obliged to encroach upon the Sabbath if it begin at sunset. And there is so much to be done in families to prepare for the Sabbath, that when they profess to keep Saturday evening, they are apt to trespass upon what they consider as holy time. And after they have been hurrying to get their work done, and their bodies are fatigued, and their minds filled with worldly cares, from which it is difficult immediately to disengage their attention, they will be poorly prepared to enter upon the sacred duties of the Sabbath. But if the Sabbath does not begin till midnight, people will have time to get their business out of the way, to banish worldly cares, to compose their minds, and prepare for "the solemn day." And their bodies and spirits, being refreshed by the repose of the night, they will be better fitted to enter upon the holy duties of the Sabbath. And in the evening of the Sabbath they will be more likely to reflect upon what they have heard and read, and to derive benefit from it, than if they felt that the Sabbath was ended, and they were at liberty to think and talk about, and attend to the world. Such a persuasion has a tendency to divert the attention from serious things, and to permit "the cares of the world to choke the word," and make it "unfruitful." And where Sabbath evening is not considered as holy time, young people and others, being already dressed in their best, will find it a very convenient time for visiting and amusement, where the conversation and employment will be such as will be directly calculated to divert the attention from the

solemn truths, which they have heard during the day, and to banish all serious reflection. If then, "the Sabbath was made for man," for his benefit, it is rational to conclude that *that* evening would be appointed to be kept, which would be most convenient, and conducive to his spiritual interest and improvement. And now will not these considerations, and these numerous texts, adduced in favor of keeping Sabbath evening, outweigh, in the view of a candid mind, the three passages supposed to favour the keeping of Saturday evening? Two of these are in the Old Testament, and only one in the New, recorded by different evangelists, and not one after the institution of the Christian Sabbath. But as God reckons the evening *succeeding* the day as belonging to the day, and as the apostles observed that evening, if others are not satisfied that it belongs to the Sabbath, it fully satisfies the mind of

MINIMUS.

---

WE cheerfully give the following unofficial review a place among our Religious Communications. It is in itself an acceptable miscellany, while its main object seems to be, to do justice to the memory of an injured name. What the unpleasant "circumstances" were, to which the writer, in the course of his remarks, takes occasion to allude, we have no distinct information; nor do we know what grounds might or might not have existence, to justify the "evil surmises" of which both he and the biographer of Doctor Parish complain, as so injurious to their deceased friend. It is a history with which we neither are, nor are solicitous to be, acquainted; and therefore we can have neither prejudice nor prepossession respecting it. But we cannot help expressing our surprise, that the author of such discourses as the Remarker introduces to our notice, should ever have fallen under "the suspicion of being a Unitarian." Indeed, had he merited this name, he had certainly deserved a worse one;



for the man who could leave behind him, prepared for publication with his own hand, sentiments so opposite to his real faith as the doctrines contained in these sermons are opposite to Unitarianism, is something more than a common errorist—he is a death-bed hypocrite, and a posthumous dissembler. If suspicion then be groundless, how deep is the wound which is thus causelessly inflicted.

An earnest zeal for the truth and a wakeful jealousy of error, in the church, are doubtless very desirable. They are necessary watchmen on the walls of Zion. They indicate a healthy tone of feeling in the religious community. But when this godly jealousy becomes bereft of candour, and gets the better of Christian charity; when it suffers itself to degenerate into mere suspicion, individually or heedlessly scattering ambiguous voices to the injury of worthy names, and spreading the blight of prejudice over the field of a public man's usefulness—then it becomes a spirit worthy of the severest reprehension.

We can conceive of no situation more embarrassing than that of a public man who has conspicuously fallen under the theological jealousies of the times. Some one has whispered a suspicion that he secretly favors this or that heresy. The whisper becomes a rumor and the rumor runs through the land—travelling faster than contradiction can follow after, and spreading its mists farther than the fullest refutation can ever come to dissipate them. In the mean time, the subject of suspicion is going on in the quiet discharge of his duties, having never heard perhaps, or having heard with a smile, of his defection from the faith. All eyes are towards him. Is he a theological professor? The citation of an unorthodox expositor, the relinquishment of an untenable dogma, the adoption of a novel phraseology, the accommodation of a statement in theology to the improved philosophy of the age—these are “confirmations strong” that the man is indeed far gone in heresy. Is he a parish minister? His regard to the common courtesies of life, in his intercourse with the unsound of faith who are his neighbors, nay his very freedom from bigotry, his Christian candor, are dark signs against him. The mischief is less extensive than in

the former case, but not less unhappy for the subject of it. He is surprised to see that his brethren begin to assume a strange reserve towards him; his affectionate parishioners, even his own begotten in the gospel, stand apart and wear a doubtful look, and he perceives at length with grief that his reputation, his usefulness, and his peace of mind, are, for a time at least, at an end.

These observations might profitably be extended into a lengthened essay on the importance of Christian candor in an age like the present,—but they would be out of place here. We will only remark further that if an uncommon boldness or prevalence of error calls for a more than ordinary vigilance in the defence of the faith once delivered to the saints, it also peculiarly demands the exercise of that charity which thinketh no evil.

#### REMARKS ON PARISH'S SERMONS.\*

WHEN a person takes up a book, almost the first inquiry is, by whom and for what purpose has it been prepared for the public. And this is by no means an unimportant inquiry, for the character of the author, and the motive of his publishing, are a necessary glossary to the words and phrases which are used in the book. An elderly and very respectable divine was, with myself, present at the delivery of a discourse by one of reputed liberal sentiments. After retiring from the house of worship, he observed that he long had his fears of such a one, but could never have supposed he had so far gone off from the truth as he now perceives him to have done. I asked him to what he objected in the discourse—whether there was any word or sentence which he would hesitate himself to use. Upon reflection, “No,” he replied, “but words in the mouth

\*Sermons, Practical and Doctrinal, by the late ELIJAH PARISH, D.D., with a Biographical Sketch of the Author. Boston. Crocker & Brewster. 1826.

of Mr. — do not mean the same thing they do in mine." The observation was correct. The sermon no doubt produced an entirely different impression upon the audience from what it would have produced had it been delivered by my aged friend. It would be a work of very considerable utility if some one would give a fair specimen of the manner and extent to which the character of the authors, the motives and circumstances of the publications, give a coloring and emphasis to the expressions, used in some of the popular polemic works of the day. "Character gives meaning to books."

In the present instance the author has been, in his ministerial office, and in his printed works, so long and so prominently before the public, that very few, into whose hands this volume is likely at present to fall, need any one to tell them who and what he was, or to be sensible of the great loss the literary, the social, and the religious world have suffered in his early and sudden departure from the world of action to the world of reward. But if in any case an individual of the present generation should have occasion to ask concerning the character of this great man, he will find a short, but a very lively and faithful answer in the Biography with which the book opens. If exhibiting to the life be an excellence in this kind of writing, we have here one of the happiest specimens which has fallen into my hands, or, within my knowledge, come before the public. Curiosity might have been gratified by the exhibition of facts, in support of the declarations there set forth, but in respect to the result, they would not have led the considerate and judicious to any other conclusions. Whoever really knew Dr. Parish would know who sat for this likeness, had no name or key been given.

VOL. I.—No. V.

30

The sermons are what they profess to be, doctrinal and practical. In the arrangement, no order seems to have been consulted, and I do not know, that any thing could have been done in this respect, which would have proved of any considerable advantage, or produced any additional interest in the work. The subjects discussed have no other connexion than is common to all great moral truths. Each discourse is assigned as an independent performance. Together, they embrace a variety of subjects nearly or quite unprecedented in any one volume which has within my recollection come before me, while some of the subjects are such as are seldom more than referred to in the pulpit, and I have my doubts whether they have before been so fully and interestingly discussed. Among those of this character, I would refer the reader to the XIth, XVIIth and XXth. The first of these, which has for its text Zach. vi. 6, is an illustration of this proposition "that all the blessings of *this life* are effected by the Spirit of God." The proposition is not new, nor has the truth escaped the knowledge of any of the people of God. Yet I very much question whether most persons, upon reading this discourse, would not feel as though new things had been told them, new and increasing obligations of gratitude to the Father of mercies brought to their recollection. In illustration of these remarks, as well as to give a specimen of the author's style and manner, I will insert a passage from this sermon, selected, not because the best, but because more entirely detached from the other parts, than any other which now meets my eye. Having in the 5th division of this discourse shown that the Holy Spirit is the author of all our *success* in the affairs of this world, he proceeds, in the 6th, to show that the comforts and felicity which men

enjoy in their acquirements come from God.

The blessing of the Lord, it maketh rich, and he addeth no sorrow with it. All consolation is from the Spirit of God. The most splendid wealth, the most powerful friends, the most exalted fame, with the richest stream of sensual delights, with the most elevated privileges for intellectual and religious improvement, unless God bless them, will leave the heart cold, and cheerless, and dead. Did the money of Gehazi comfort his heart? Was he happier for his bags of silver, and his changes of raiment? The leprosy was in his silver, the poison of death in his garments. Was Ahab, or Haman happy in their numerous children, or ample possessions? In the proud palace, and at a royal banquet, one hears the sentence of death, the other pines and sickens for his neighbor's vineyard, and instead of being crowned with victory, is borne dying from the field of battle." p. 233-4.

But to avoid the inference which sluggish impiety might draw from this view, the author, towards the close takes occasion to say that "the Spirit of God more generally blesses men according to their manifest diligence, their discretion, perseverance, and fidelity."

'What a man soweth that shall he reap.' Every man assumes the complexion of his own character, chooses his own course, carves his own portion, secures his own reward. The measure of our sincerity, of our faithfulness, and wisdom, is the general measure of our success, and of our felicity. In those instances where the sovereignty of God seems to exclude not only all merit, but all worth or agency of man, it may possibly be found that their character, what they are and what they do, has more influence than is generally supposed. God blesses men, by first making them good and wise, to prepare them for subsequent favors, and to render them the instruments of his own felicities. Joseph has been mentioned; but after all the interpositions of Providence, and the displays of divine sovereignty, in

his behalf, may it not be said that the conduct or personal worth of the man was the germ of his flourishing honours? Piety was the basis of his reputation and success. His innocence in his master's house, his integrity in prison, received the divine favor and the inspiration of wisdom. Hence his capacity of explaining mysteries; hence his fame, his power, his riches, his greatness. p. 236.

The XVIIth sermon is the sketch of the character of Elias. James v. 17, 18. The perusal of this discourse would, it is believed, with most men be attended with a kind of surprise, that with the Bible in their hands, they had known so little of the character of this man, one of the most interesting personages whose name and character has been handed down to us, when it was possible to know so much. In delineating his character, the author directs our attention to the following particulars. 1. That Elijah was a man of remarkable faith. 2. That he exercised a remarkable influence over the minds of others, possessing a wonderful talent of persuasion. 3. That he had a singular vein of bold humour and sarcasm. 4. That he was variable in his temper, and subject to a melancholy depression of spirits. 5. That he was remarkably ardent and successful in his devotions. By way of illustrating the second particular he introduces the history of the poor woman of Zarephath, of Obadiah, of Ahab, and the events which happened in the hill of Carmel. The author's statement of this last circumstance I will introduce here.

Excepting in one instance, we have not heard Elijah address a public assembly, then his power of persuasion surpassed all example. Nothing equals this in the history of eloquence. In imagination pass to the land of Canaan, lift your eye to the hill of Carmel, covered with the thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand of Israel.



Behold the prophet of God rising in the midst of this boundless multitude. His person is uncouth; he seems more like a hermit, than a powerful orator; he is a hairy man and has a leathern girdle round his loins, surveying the immense throng, his eyes affect his heart. He exclaims 'How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God follow him; but if Baal, follow him.' His words are armed with power; they produce conviction; the people are silent; they answer him not a word; the doctrine appeared reasonable. Having made such progress, he pursues his advantage and proposes an experiment to settle the dispute. "The God who answered by fire, let him be God." 'If Baal answers by fire, I will join you in his worship. If Jehovah answers by fire, then you will unite with me and worship him.' Never did an orator succeed better. The people, all the people answered and said, "It is well spoken." Their confidence is gained. With anxiety they now wait the trial by fire. The prophets of Baal proceed to the experiment and utterly fail. Elijah then erects an altar, calls upon God, and he answers by fire. The people are satisfied; they are overcome with the force of truth, they fall on their faces and cry, "The Lord, he is God; Jehovah he is the God;" they abandon idolatry. Was not this the triumph of human eloquence? What was the trembling of Cæsar, addressed by Cicero, in behalf of Ligarius? What were the shouts of the Athenian rabble, when Demosthenes spoke? How feeble and trivial was the speech of St. Paul, before the Areopagus, compared with this overwhelming address of Elijah to the tribes of Israel? 'Those orators influenced an individual, or a few persons, or a common assembly, at most; but the millions of Israel are swayed by the voice of Elijah, as a field of wheat bows before the gale, or a forest, before the wide-spreading conflagration.'—p. 322-3.

Under the fourth head, after having given some general remarks on the extent and limits of the power and faculties of man, the author proceeds to observe:

Elijah had just manifested the most astonishing force of character;

he had assumed the direction of the king, he had superseded the royal authority, and ordered four hundred and fifty prophets to execution. At the close of this wonderful scene, he learns that Jezebel was angry, and threatened him with a woman's revenge. A sudden panic strikes his spirit, his resolution is gone; his spirit dies within him, he flies for his life to Beersheba, in the kingdom of Judah. Here he was perfectly safe, beyond the jurisdiction of Ahab, and under the protection of the pious king Jehosaphat. Indeed, it is not probable that any danger was near him. All Israel had just raised their voices in his favour. Would the Queen have dared to touch a hair of his head? She was afraid of Elijah, and wished to frighten him from the great work of reformation, which he had so triumphantly commenced. Therefore she sends him word that she will slay him. Her plot succeeded. The melancholy prophet fled from Beersheba alone, a days journey into the howling wilderness. His terrors seem to have deprived him of his reason. He sits down under a juniper tree and prays that he may die. Men are seldom in the best state of mind when they are forward to die. From the wilderness he travels a hundred and fifty miles to Mount Nebo. This occupied him forty days, going through by-ways and hiding himself in secret corners; his progress was less than four miles a day. Is this my lord, Elijah, who just now swayed the hearts of Israel with the breath of his divine eloquence? Lord, what is man!

The XXth, which is the last we mentioned as peculiarly noticeable for a kind of pleasing novelty, is an attempt, and in our judgment a successful one, to show that some of the most important and difficult doctrines of revelation are supported by the events of Providence. The text is Ps. xviii, 3, "as for God, his way is perfect," and Ps. xix, 7, "The law of the Lord is perfect." In the fourth division of this discourse, the author's object is to show that the doctrine of Election to eternal life is in accordance with the doings of God, with respect to many things in this world.

How successful he was in this particular, the following passage will in part show.

Probably no person in this country, attaches the least personal merit to the circumstances of a man's birth. No child is better or worse, born in a palace or a shed. No matter whether he be "below the dome, or above the hut." Yet on this single circumstance of birth, commonly depend, in a great measure, the knowledge, the religion, and happiness of the person. One is born in the cottage of vice, and endures hunger and cold, and generally, though not always, exhibits the vice and ignorance of his father. Another is born in the sober mansion of piety and knowledge, and often, though not always, acquires the knowledge, the virtue, and happiness of his parents. One poor babe, without any fault of his own, is born in Africa, and is a slave. Another receives existence in the wilds of America, and of course is a pagan and a savage. Another first sees the light in Arabia, and spends his life following his flocks from one spring and pasture to another, often scorched with the burning winds of the desert, often mad with hunger and thirst, his hand against every man and every man's hand against him, a robber on land, and a pirate on the sea, Mahomet his prophet, and the koran his Bible.

You are born in a Christian land, of Christian parents, who are faithful and kind, who instruct you by precept and example, to be a disciple of Jesus. What an immense difference is here made by the providence of God, between man and man. Is not here a display of divine sovereignty, disregarding all personal merit, as evident as in election to eternal life? Indeed where can you look and not witness a manifestation of this divine attribute? Who gave to Buchanan his spirit of sacred enterprise, to the apostolic Elliott his willingness to labour for the salvation of savages, to Whitefield his overwhelming eloquence, to Edwards his fervent piety and wonderful energy of mind? Does not God as well in his providence as in his word, say, "I will do all my pleasure, and my counsel it shall stand?" His word and his providence agree, and are perfect. He is of one mind in the kingdom of grace and providence, in the events

which we witness, in the doctrines which we read.—pp. 399, 400.

An attentive perusal of this discourse, would, I apprehend, lead most men who are capable and willing to receive the most obvious meaning of scripture and Providence, as that which the Holy Ghost intended to set forth, to the same conclusion, to which the author came; "That we obtain no relief by rejecting the deep and difficult doctrines from revelation. Though you blot them from your creed, Providence spreads them before your eyes, sounds them in your ears, reveals them from every quarter. Though you erase them from your Bibles, they are written in capitals on every page in Providence."

The seventh is a very interesting and important discourse. The subject is the influence of education. In this discourse the author has committed an error in first assuming as a fact, that of which he afterwards occupies the whole discourse, as an illustration or proof. Yet it is an error which will be easily overlooked, if not forgotten, long before any one shall have read half the pages which this discourse fills. Individuals may make exceptions to particular statements, they may not understand the relevancy of some particulars; for instance, what is said of the possession of iron; they may doubt the extent of the influence of some of the causes here referred to; but if, after all these and whatever else may be said in the way of deduction from the sterling merit we believe it to possess, the reading does not leave upon the mind a great additional dread and fear of what can warp the judgment, taint the morals, or corrupt the heart, the cause, I must seriously believe would be found, were investigation made, in the lamentable fact that the individual has not that holy and pure principle which makes him dread

every false way. I must be indulged in furnishing the reader with a paragraph containing a part of the reasons suggested by the author, why, if education has such an influence over men, those who are brought up in the same school, in the same neighbourhood, and under the same roof, do often exhibit principles and dispositions so entirely unlike.

It is not believed that the greatest number of lessons, or the longest lessons, will always have the greatest effect. No. You cannot calculate the effect of education from its quantity, as you do of nitrous grain in a rock. No. The temper, and the force, and the adaptation, and the time, and the place, and the character of the parties, all come in for an incalculable share of the influence. Sometimes one book will triumph over all the impressions made by whole libraries, one companion will make a deeper impression than the whole circle of friends had done. Sometimes one word may do more to form the character, than all the sermons, all the lectures, and all the conversation ever heard. A youth who has been frank, open, unguarded, may by the reading of one book, become prudent, cautious, circumspect. A youth who had been sedate, reserved, serious by a change of companions may become cheerful, gay, and humorous. Some such incidental cause may produce the difference of virtue and vice in the same house. Children of the same house do not all receive the same impressions, they do not hear they do not see, the same things. They are very far from receiving the same education. One is at home, while his brother or sister is abroad. In those different places they see and hear things very different. One child reads this book, another, that. One child is sickly, and finds in his parents, a nurse and a physician. One is wilful and headstrong, and views his parents as two officers of justice. One is mild, modest, docile, and finds his parents delightful companions. In these different circumstances must not the character of the children be formed in a different manner, be imbued with a different spirit? While these things unite to show the difficulty and

the danger, in executing the business of education, they have no tendency to lessen its importance. While we discover the delicacy of the task, we also learn how powerful are impressions, and how necessary are wholesome discipline and a uniform system of instruction and example."—p. 176-7.

The closing paragraph is solemn, and worthy to be impressed on the mind and heart of every parent and every child.

"Finally, how important are the periods of childhood and youth. In these periods, education is chiefly acquired, the character is then formed, the person generally becomes what he is to be forever and ever. What is sown in Spring will be reaped in autumn. The impressions and passions of childhood and youth will be experienced in old age. Every thing, my young friends, is important to you. As the atmosphere, in some places, conveys health, in others, death, so the place where you live may cause moral health, or spiritual death. The books which you read, the sermons which you hear, may convey saving truth or fatal error. One wicked companion may be as fatal to you, as the serpent of Paradise. One evil example may disturb your judgment, may fascinate your imagination, may influence your passions. One alluring word, one enticing look, may, like enchantment, relax the vigour of your resolution, and plunge you down the gulf of ruin. Take heed then to all your ways, your labours, your amusements, your studies, your words, your thoughts;—the objects which you see, the sounds which you hear. "He that walketh with the wise shall be wise, but a companion of fools shall be destroyed."—pp. 184, -5.

The discourses about the correctness of which, there will probably exist as much doubt in the minds of evangelical people as any, are the first and eighth.



The first, on Luke ii. 14, was preached before the convention of Congregational ministers in Boston, 1821. Then the copy was presented to the Mass. Peace Society, and had, under the direction of that body, passed through several editions. In regard to the general doctrine maintained, "That God designs by the gospel to establish lasting peace on the earth and good will towards men," there can be no question. But there does remain a question as to the inferences drawn from this,—that nations should make no provision for war, and that all excitements to war should be done away—such as military honours, titles, and rewards, martial music, and the war song of the poet. Destroy, says he, the means of mischief, and you destroy the mischief itself. It is to be apprehended that the author overrated the effect of these things. They, we doubt, do much to keep up and foster a spirit for war, but they do not create the disposition to it. As long as the passion reigns within, individuals and nations, when their resentment is kindled, will contend, as if they are not supplied before hand with weapons, they will find them afterwards. "*Furor, ministrat arma.*"

I do not intend by these remarks to countenance war, or to inculcate the belief that much would not be done to prevent its occurrence, were the suggestions of the reverend author attentively regarded. All means calculated to prevent the occurrence of this greatest curse of our race, should be used, and used too, rigorously and extensively. And no man should think he had done enough till the peaceful spirit of the gospel shall pervade every heart or fill every land. And in view of the blessings connected with the approach of that happy day, how thankfully should we receive every effort of such men as the author of this sermon, to hasten its arrival.

The other sermon in respect to the doctrine of which there will be a diversity of sentiment, is that in which the author labours to show that what is familiarly called the *prayer of faith* will be answered. What he means by this will perhaps be best expressed in his own words. "The doctrine taught here, does not contradict a common opinion that the prayer of faith will obtain the very thing, or something which is better, but proceeds farther, and asserts that we may by prayer obtain the very thing desired."

I should too far trespass on your pages, to exhibit the argument constructed by the preacher to support his doctrine; or to state the views which to my mind, render the argument inclusive. But while I express a doubt respecting the correctness of the point attempted to be established, or of its great practical utility, if it could be proved, and also of the bearing of the text, upon the point at issue, and of many of the other scriptures introduced to support the doctrine, I would be far from intimating that the sermon itself is not important, and calculated to do much good. It was evidently written with great labour, and after much investigation, is full of the most solemn and affecting truths; and it is not easy to conceive how any pious individual could read it and not feel an increased sense of the importance of continuing instant in prayer; or how those who have hitherto neglected this service should not be convinced that they are in a great transgression. The subject of prayer was one on which the reverend author, when he referred to it, spoke with great force and solemnity; and it would be easy to gather up many instances of the deep and lasting impressions which his discourses on this subject produced upon the minds of some of his hearers. And those who read this discourse, and indeed, others in this

volume, ought to do it with the awakening consideration, that to some, the same truths have proved the word of eternal life.

I shall mention but one discourse more, and this is the fourth. Psalm xlv. 6. The express object of this discourse is to set forth the divine character of the Lord Jesus Christ. And it is what the author intended it should be, a plain, popular exhibition of revelation on that subject; not a learned, critical discussion, but a sermon which could be written only by one who had given considerable attention to the subject. The history of all the circumstances which gave rise to this discourse would be, in respect to our race, a mournfully interesting, but probably not a desirable document. I revert to the subject, that if there be any suffering under the same evil, they may not feel as though some strange thing had happened to them. The author of these discourses, who had all his life been considered and indeed considered himself, of the strictest sect of orthodoxy, found himself fallen under the suspicion of leaning towards Unitarianism. Evil surmises spread among his people, distressed the minds of his church, and took considerable hold of the feelings of neighbouring churches and ministers. No one to our knowledge ever alleged that he had preached in public, or intimated in his conversation, that he had in any degree become doubtful of the truth of his former faith. On the contrary, his preaching remained the same; his conversation the same; to every one who asked him concerning his faith, he was free and open to confess that his mind had undergone no change. To a written question "Is Dr. Parish a Unitarian?" put into his hand on convention day, in Boston, he replied in writing, "*no! no! no!*" All was however to little or no effect. Suspicion had fixed

upon him and would not be driven from her rest. Dr. Parish found his ministerial usefulness apparently decreasing, from this report, and under these circumstances wrote this sermon, and preached it first to his own people, and then to some of the neighboring societies, and finally printed it at his own charge, and circulated it among the people in the vicinity. And it may not be improper to add that notwithstanding all this, it was declared perhaps by more than one, that neither this sermon, nor any thing which Dr. Parish had said or could say, would produce the belief that Dr. Parish was not a Unitarian, at least, in *heart*. Well might the learned biographer say "it is not easy to conceive the horror and dismay which is occasioned by the suggestion that such or such a minister is becoming a Unitarian."

I have thought it best to revert to this subject because it is supposed there are individuals yet found who have never had their fears produced by these surmises corrected. And that there are many who perhaps have heard that these sermons have been published, are insensible how great a support the cause of truth and religion does actually find in them.

I had not intended, when I perceived the extent to which my remarks reached, to refer particularly to another discourse. But I cannot well refrain from mentioning the next in order, on the Human nature of Christ, from the use the author makes of this fact, to show the errors of the Unitarian scheme. Here the author has raised up an almost new mound against the spread of that error. And one which I think the advocates of that doctrine, as now held, will find it difficult to remove. It would not be easy to present the reasonings of the author in such a condensed form as to allow their insertion in this place. We

must refer the reader to the work itself, promising that he will find his advantage in its perusal.

I must bring my remarks to a close, though I am free to confess that I have hardly touched upon those parts of the volume to which, when I commenced, I intended to direct my particular attention, nor referred to those passages which, in perusal, I had marked as of more peculiar interest. The reader may rest assured that the real silver and gold has not all been extracted. There is a rich untouched mine remaining, which those who seek for knowledge as for hid treasure, will do well to secure to themselves.

Of a volume so perfectly miscellaneous as this, it is not possible to present any very condensed view. In passing through it, one is entertained very much in the same way as a traveller, by the constantly changing scenes, that pass before him; who, so far as he reasons on the subject of his enjoyment, is surprised that he can be so constantly pleased, and perfectly taken up with objects diversified by so great and often abrupt discriminations. Mountains and plains, hills and vallies, rivers and brooks, all beautiful, all differing, and yet all filling the soul with the most pleasurable satisfaction.

These discourses are marked for originality of conception, arrangement, expression, and illustration. I know of no volume of sermons equal to them in this particular. Nor are they scarcely less noticeable for their spirit and animation. The author was awake when he wrote them, and the reader will be in no danger of sleeping when dwelling upon their pages. Dr. Parish was long ago pronounced, by a distinguished divine, who has now also gone to the judge of all the earth, to be almost unequalled in his powers of condensation. And his title to this praise he has abundantly supported in the volume be-

fore us. It is not a little surprising to observe how many facts and thoughts are frequently brought together in a small space. As many are often found on a single page as, being dilated in some men's minds, would fill a sermon. But while so condensed I believe the reader will agree with me that there is no obscurity. Whatever the author intended to advance, be it truth or be it error, be it important or be it vain, he has said it in such a way as to be understood.

That there are no faults in the style or arrangement of these discourses, no words or sentiments which need qualification, is not intended to be said. What human composition is without them? It must be remembered too that this is a posthumous publication; and though most or all of the sermons are said to be prepared for the press by the author, yet every one who has the least experience on the subject, knows how much more easily a fault in style, arrangement, or words is detected in the proof sheet than in the manuscript, with all its interlinings, transpositions, and erasures. Many little things which would have given a finish to the work would no doubt have been attended to, had the author lived to superintend the publication of this volume.

The circumstance which will perhaps strike the mind of the reader as the most liable to exception, is occasionally a want of *qualification* in some of the sentiments. Yet in most instances when these occur, if the reader will have patience to see his author through before he condemns, he will find all the anticipated evils and errors, into which he feared these assertions would lead, removed, and just the truth taught and the impression made which he would wish. In the discourses on Education, and Diligence, there are exemplifications of these remarks.



To say that these sermons appear as well from the press as they did from the pulpit would be a stigma upon human nature. Every one who is made in the common form or condition of man ought to be ashamed to have this said of any of his performances, designed for a public assembly. Shall the voice, the manner, the life and presence, of the noblest work of God, add nothing to the beauty, the interest, or to the impression of divine truth? Dr. Parish, I am happy to know, was not one of those of whom it could be said

"In point of sermons 'tis confess'd,  
The English clergy make the best.  
But this appears we must confess  
Not from the pulpit, but the press."

Though these sermons lose something of their interest because we can have them no longer from his lips, who, "in his eloquence, says his Biographer, was equalled by few and surpassed by none," the reader must not infer that there is a scanty repast for the understanding or the heart or life ready for him. Who has inferred this of the orations of Demosthenes or Cicero,

of Pitt or Burke or a host of others, who in their writings have left an inexhaustible source of information and delight; though could we have seen them in their personal exhibitions, we undoubtedly should have been even more instructed and better pleased.

In conclusion, I must recommend these sermons to the divine, to the man of letters and the man of taste, to the humble Christian, and to those who have persuaded themselves there is nothing which can command the respect of the wise and great in the peculiar doctrines of the religion of Christ.

If these remarks have any influence in drawing the attention of the community to a book which has afforded me increased pleasure in the third or fourth reading, the object for which they are made will be answered. The volume is certainly valuable, and the family have performed a very commendable service in causing it to be published. And if the community are not instructed and improved by it, the reason must be sought for not in the want of opportunity, but in the neglect of the means.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

*To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.*

WITH much interest and satisfaction I have read your remarks upon the "Brief view of the American Education Society," &c. in your No. for February. I am much pleased with the deference and affection, which you manifest toward that Society, while you express your honest "doubts respecting the present system of appropriations." I was far from feeling any such doubts, when I read their admirable communication; and I dare not say, that your reasons have

conduced to draw me any nearer the point of dubitation. Shall I be permitted to express two or three queries respecting the foundation of some of your doubts. You take it for granted, that by "the present system," the "spirits" of beneficiaries, after entering the ministry, will be "oppressed, and their independence of character restrained, by a heavy load of debt." There is a kind of independence; the opposite of humility, which may indeed be "oppressed" by the "present system"—an independence, of

which most young ministers, from too much admiration, are in the greatest danger—an independence which none perhaps would more ardently deprecate than you. But is not “the present system” peculiarly fitted to call into exercise and confirm that sense of entire dependence upon Christ, to form and improve those habits of vigorous industry, which united, constitute that true Christian independence, which can face a frowning world, and urge on the war of extermination against all the powers of darkness? Is it not good for a man, especially, if destined for the sacred ministry, that he bear the yoke in his youth? May we not presume, that in almost every instance, the stimulated and devoted energies of the beneficiary, by the good hand of his God upon him, will disburden him of the “load” that is feared as so great an evil?—and that by efforts which will be really beneficial?

What if he should find it needful to devote twelve or eighteen months to school-teaching? Would the time be lost to his own improvement? Would it be lost to the holy cause, that warms and dilates his heart? Would not the advantage be much, I had almost said much every way? A bishop should be apt to teach. Next to piety itself and holy zeal, perhaps no qualification is more conducive to ministerial usefulness, than aptness for teaching. Where shall it be acquired? At the Academy? At College? At the Theological Seminary? Are these institutions favoured with professors of this invaluable art? Would to Heaven they were. Will not one year, spent at the head of a school, effect more proficiency in this art, than ten in these institutions? Will he not also in that year, be likely to make as much progress in mental improvement and *useful* literature, as in any year at college? and

much more in the knowledge of human nature? Will it not be peculiarly conducive to improve his style of writing?—not indeed to render it more classically\* elegant—more conformed to the model of Cicero, Sallust, Johnson, or Blair; but more perspicuous to the illiterate; more suited to impart instruction, conviction and salvation to children, in years or in knowledge? How often has piety wept to hear the youthful ambassador of Christ deliver his ardent and solemn message, as it were, in an unknown tongue!—in language above the understanding of most of his hearers! Is not experience in teaching children one of the best preventives of this *barbarous*† and soul-destroying practice?

Is it not highly important, that ministers should be experienced in school-teaching, that they may the better discharge their duties to teachers, to schools and to their own households; and also that they may more effectually co-operate in improving literary institutions throughout the world?

I knew a man about thirty years ago, who upon leaving college with the ministry in view, devoted one year to teaching. His chief object was to qualify himself for the sacred office, which he afterwards sustained. The acquisitions of that year, he has ever since considered as more conducive to pastoral usefulness.

\*Is not the *CHARMING* word *classical*, as opposed to *colloquial*, producing incalculable injury to the style of some of our theological students? If the preacher rejects colloquial expressions, how can he be understood by those who know scarcely any other? It is one of the brightest glories of the gospel, that it is designed for the poor. Wo to that evangelist, who addresses them in language which they cannot understand. Upon every discourse of this character, let him write “*The glory is departed*,” and water it with the tears of repentance.

†See 1 Cor. xiv. 11.

ness, than those of any year at college. It is his decided opinion that all, who have the ministry in view, should, if possible, devote one or two years to this important employment.

The more immediate good to their pupils, which must result from the labors of beneficiaries in this employment, is yet to be considered. This I cannot but estimate very highly. Confident, I am, that if "two or three hundred" of these precious youths could take the management of as many schools for a few months annually, it would prove, at least, for several years to come, a better means than any other yet proposed, "of elevating the character and usefulness of our common schools." I am indeed favorably disposed to the highly commended plan of making "the business of instruction a distinct profession." But a considerable time must elapse, before any of the advantages of this plan can be realized; and many years more before they can become extensive. It is doubtful, whether any now living will ever see half of our schools supplied by those, who shall be teachers by profession. In the mean time, what shall we do for teachers? Can beneficiaries be excused from this momentous work? Have we not reason to be thankful not only for pious beneficiaries, who as pupils, bless our academies and colleges, but that so many of them are blessing our schools, as teachers? Can the beneficiary forget, that he is not his own?—that he has most solemnly devoted himself to Christ and the church?—that to Christ and the church, he must be forever devoted? Must he not feel something of the awful and elevating responsibility of a missionary? May we not hope, that he will be an example to his pupils of whatsoever things are lovely and of good report; that under the commanding influence of such examples he will address them

with the heart of a missionary, and plead with them to be reconciled to God? May we not also expect, that both in his closet and in his school, he will plead with God to have mercy on them? and that his effectual fervent prayers will avail? Nay, have not such prayers availed already? Have not beneficiaries already pursued these methods of advancing the Redeemer's kingdom? And are there not some new-born souls, who feel themselves to be the spiritual children of these sons of charity: some, that are prepared to become themselves beneficiaries, and to pursue with others, the same course that has brought them out of darkness into marvellous light? What might we not hope from three hundred such;—so many Christian warriors, commanding and training each his school? Could we expect better things from an equal number, who should be teachers by profession? Better literary instructions we might indeed expect. But the *Christian Spectator* need not be informed, that these are not the one thing needful. They are lighter than vanity, when put in the balance with the weightier matters of the law. How many real Christians can we expect to find in three hundred such teachers? Perhaps thirty. Even if there should be twice that number, it is my decided opinion, that the three hundred beneficiaries, considered merely as teachers, would have the greater influence in promoting the welfare of the world.

Even if we had a supply of teachers by profession, it seems that we could hardly release beneficiaries from the same employment. How much less, as the case now is. It will not be thought strange, then, that with these views, I am very far from doubting either the "policy" or the "wisdom" of the Directors in relation to this subject.

Some beneficiaries, indeed, may not have health to keep school, and



maintain a respectable literary standing, during their collegiate course. Let such by no means attempt to do more than they are able. They may take a year from the midst of their literary course, or after its close.

With regard to the pecuniary prospects of the beneficiary, his ability to procure a library, &c., "the present system of appropriations" appears to be more eligible than one that might seem more liberal. I take for granted (what I presume will be found almost universally true) that before he settles as pastor, his debt will be paid or remitted. In such a case, the habit of economy, previously formed, cannot fail to increase pecuniary ability. But even if a small debt should remain, there seems to be no reason to fear that it will impair his usefulness by depressing his spirits. We may calculate with confidence, that it will soon be discharged, and that in five years, his basket and his store will acknowledge the superiority of the present system.

You express an apprehension, that the employment of beneficiaries in teaching may, at least for a time, prevent those efforts, that would otherwise be made, to furnish better qualified instructors, who shall be entirely devoted to the work. I cannot but indulge a hope that even in this respect, the consequences will not prove injurious. It appears highly probable, that in two ways the teaching beneficiary may conduce to the improvement of other teachers. His pious example, his faithful instructions, his tender exhortations, his ardent prayers, can hardly fail to have a salutary influence upon some others, and induce them to do the same. And when Seminaries shall be opened for the express purpose of qualifying teachers, as will doubtless very soon be the case, it is highly probable that some benefi-

ciaries will become members; that they will there exert the same salutary influence, which they are now exerting in our academies and colleges, and thus conduce to prepare their associates to communicate the most important instructions in greater abundance, and in a manner more faithful and more effectual.

A TEACHER.

---

REMARKS UPON WORDSWORTH'S POETRY.

It is conceded, I believe, by all who have read the Poetry of Wordsworth, that he has just conceptions of the use and dignity of Poetry. A position which he strongly maintains is, that Poetry ought to enlighten and instruct. He contends that it is altogether an unworthy object for minds of true poetic compass and depth to be employed in furnishing amusement, or even in communicating indirect instruction. With him, a poet is a sound philosopher. He has accurately studied the laws of thought. His power does not consist simply in a reach of imagination, or in the felicitous selection or invention of imagery. He has ability to follow out a train of associations, and intellectually discern what are conformable to the truth of nature. A book of poetry should furnish substantial nourishment. It ought to enlighten us in our duty, and stimulate us to walk firmly in the path of virtue. Harmonious versification and true taste may please us, but permanent benefit is the legitimate aim of poetry.

Such being the theory of Wordsworth, it is interesting to inquire what he has accomplished. Do his volumes give decided and clear testimony to the worth of his principles?

Without going into any thing like an analysis of his poetry, it is evident, that he has secured an im-

portant advantage, by excluding every thing wild and improbable. There is the charm of novelty thrown over his conceptions.—There is the impress of original and unfettered power. But it is not a charm gathered from the fields of fiction, or the regions of possibility. It is not an originality breaking loose from the authoritative laws of the human mind. From the real world, material and moral, he has gathered a vast number of facts and illustrations, and submitted them to the processes of a powerful mind, and they have come out, clothed in new and beautiful forms. He had thus no need to go back and re-embody any of the marvellous doings of the middle ages; or to select from the extravagant records of an Indian Mythology; or to paint some mysterious being, half demon, half man—employing his knowledge of human nature to wage a merciless warfare against its best affections, and his diabolical strength to tear down the mounds between earth and the prison of despair.

Scott, and Southey, and Byron, were able to invest their poems with an overwhelming interest. For a time, edition after edition was almost literally devoured! They addressed the reader's most awakened curiosity. They seized and occupied his whole being with the exclusiveness of a powerfully written novel. But the interest is passed away. Their popularity is altogether on the wane. Their poems were made to amuse, not to instruct. They did not appeal to the understanding. Wordsworth, on the contrary, wishes for no unnatural excitement. He addresses the entire human soul, as made up of intellect and desire and moral feeling. He throws around him no fictitious interest. He furnishes bone and muscle as well as elegant form, and ruddy cheeks, and auburn locks.

Again, Wordsworth understands well our social nature. On no

theme does he pour forth more delicious melodies. The thousand forms of love and tenderness in maternal assiduity, in delicate sisterly affection, in the confidence of smiling infancy, and all the blest scenes of family happiness seem intimately present to his mind. The poet also feels in his heart what flows from his pen. Some of his most touching descriptions have manifestly their originals in his own house. The sweet smiles of his own daughter just waking up on the shores of being, the mysterious lines on the countenance of her who is the same to him in joy and grief, the crushing of hopes, the wasting sickness of the heart, when fatal disease has entered his window, give to his poetry a reality better than the charm of versification, than the roving of the sweetest fancy. This is another circumstance, which stamps utility on his poetry. It is something more than amusement to see embodied in language, what one has felt, and will feel every day of his earthly existence. Most minds, too little disciplined to catch their own evanescent thoughts can thus leisurely survey what is spread out before them as on bright canvass. Moreover, these feelings are the common property of all who live and breathe. In the joys of literary acquisition, or scientific discovery, a vast majority of mankind cannot at all participate. But let a poet draw from the deep wells of human sympathy, —and multitudes, the degraded and the noble, the tottering with age and the glad youth, will come with their urns and drink and be refreshed. The story of Poor Margaret in the first book of the "Excursion," might be selected as poetry, that speaks to the hearts of all. Is confined to no language. It can be appreciated in all varieties of conditions. Its influence is permanently beneficial, for it is the poetry of truth and nature.

With equal pleasure, does Words-

worth dwell upon the supreme God as he has written his name and his glory upon the works of his hands. Every where does this Great Being reign for the happiness of his creation. The path of life is covered over with evidences of his paternal kindness. Even the seeming visitations of his wrath in the devouring tempest, in the blank desolation of winter, and the un pitying ravage of death and the grave, are still the works of Him whose mercy knows no limit. And here it is matter of regret, that this gifted poet, did not enter more fully, than he has, into the ample fields of revelation. If, in standing in these outer courts, he looks with wonder at the majestic temple, which God has reared in his creation, and listens with joy to the sweet music, which now and then steals upon his ear, how must his heart have expanded, if he had ventured into the inner sanctuary, and heard the full chorus of happy voices. This power to describe the facts of natural Theology is derived in a great degree from the Christian Scriptures. These exert a powerful indirect effect upon those poets who are opposed to a careful and thorough perusal of them. It has long been a maxim with very respectable naturalists and poets that the contemplation of nature leads the mind intuitively to God. But why not reverse the process? Why not let the full light from eternity *first* pour upon the mind—before it fastens upon the wonders of the material creation? In this way the obscurities of nature would be explained, the fact that God has one grand system where ever he has displayed his energy or his grace would be clearly illustrated. The poet's views would enlarge themselves into the illimitable tract of eternity. A freshness and beauty would descend on this earth's landscapes, like those with which the human soul is arrayed, when it first wakes

up from its guilt and danger, and admits Christ into its bosom the hope of glory. God is present almost to its natural vision. Every earthly thing is pervaded by the great Spirit. Such would be the poet's experience, if he would admit the God of the Bible into his imaginations.

But where Wordsworth does employ the facts of revelation, he is guilty of a species of unfairness. The doctrines of salvation ought to be viewed in *all* their bearings. It is very easy indeed to separate what may be termed intellectual from what is purely religious. To a person of vigorous imagination, the doctrine of the resurrection for instance lays open themes for wide and glorious thoughts. Illustrations and imagery can be gathered up unspoiled by any heathen poet. But view the sublime doctrines of the Bible in *all* their scriptural connexions, and the poet shrinks away. He cannot bear to illustrate the fact, that some shall rise to shame and everlasting contempt. He cannot bear to stand on the heaving ground and behold millions rising from the dust of death "filthy still." He reads not on the doors of the new heavens—there shall enter in nothing that defileth. But what right has a poet to take a partial view of this great subject? What right has Wordsworth to divest it of its unwelcome features? In his "Churchyard among the mountains," the grave is made a quiet resting place for too many who descend into its bosom. Some mysterious refining process is assigned to the tomb, by which those shall be made pure, who on earth are "remembered with deep awe." The immortality, which is brought to light in his poetry is too often a distinct thing from what Paul described the Christian's immortality to be. There are funeral associations embodied in delicious verses. But he has not engraved on them



the deep straight lines of truth. He has not come up to the breadth and spirituality of the themes.

Nevertheless, his poetry will be read. There is thought on every page. No where is there a string of common-place fancies, or stale personifications. The purity and delicacy of all his associations are worthy of the highest commendation, and afford a delightful contrast to several of the distinguished poets of this age. Were his views of man's present duties and coming destinies the same with those of Milton and Cowper, we should find no difficulty in assigning to his works the same certain immortality.

A. S. E.

---

FROM THE COMMON PLACE BOOK OF  
A DECEASED FRIEND

"We honor God most, when we are most like him in the temper and disposition of mind."—*Pythagoras*.

This sentiment of the sage of Samos, deserves to be recorded in letters of gold. It proves that he was worthy of the title, *the wise man*, which he disclaimed for the more modest one, *a lover of wisdom*. He speaks like a Christian, who all his life time had visited the oracles of truth. Before as well as since the time of Balak, the great inquiry among thinking men has been, wherewith shall I come before the Lord? and there have been almost as many different answers as there have been questions. Yet this heathen gives an answer, which ought to shame many a one, who bears the name of Christian. To be like God is to honour him. There is an accuracy in the account given. It is not required that we should be like him, in what are called his natural attributes, but in his moral perfections. We can be like him in the temper and disposition of our minds. We can love what he loves. How elevated is the character of the good man. He

seems to rise nearly to a level with angels who are eminently like God.

"How near he presses on the seraph's wing!  
Which is the seraph? which the child of day?"

Nothing is more common than to hear persons, and those too of very good character, complain of the state of the weather, and express the wish that it might be otherwise than it is. At one time you will hear them say, 'I wish we might have some rain, or snow;' at another, 'I wish it might clear off,' &c. In short there is scarcely any topic so frequently in the mouths of men when they meet, as the state of the weather; and you will generally hear something from them concerning it, which either expresses their positive dissatisfaction with it, or manifests a deplorable insensibility to the goodness exhibited in those great arrangements of providence, which are constantly sustaining us in being, and pouring around us the blessings of life. All this I consider as directly opposed to the great duty of *resignation*. Every wind that blows, every storm that rages, every cold that freezes, and every warmth that melts and oppresses, whether it be pleasant or unpleasant, is such as necessarily results from the great arrangements of Providence; and it is obviously our duty to be resigned to such dispensations as it is to be resigned, to any thing whatever, which we may consider as a calamity. The general laws which regulate the weather, are on the whole, wonderfully adapted to the wants of the animate creation; and whatever unpleasant irregularity there may be attending the operation of these laws, they ought all to be considered as *necessarily* attending it, and to be submitted to as an inevitable result of a vast beneficent arrangement for our good. Should it be replied, perhaps some other mode of governing the world, would have

been preferable and more conducive to our good, I reply that this cannot be shown, but on the contrary there are many very important reasons for preferring the mode of administration by general laws, such as the fact that without them, there would be no such thing as a connexion between cause and effect, means and ends; and were this connexion to be suspended, the business of human life would instantly stop, and the whole race become extinct. Besides it should be remembered that this world is a state of moral discipline, and it is fit and important that we should have to contend with trouble and calamity. A person entirely resigned to all the ordinances of heaven, however adverse in appearance, has I may venture to say, advanced far in the duty of self-command, and the duty of noticing in all the phenomena around us, the hand of a great beneficent parent.

"Many things are to be done and abstained from, solely for the sake of habit."  
—*Dr. Paley.*

If an act is in itself morally wrong, it ought to be abstained from of course, aside from the consideration, that should it become habitual, it would contaminate very much the purity of our character. But an act ought to be abstained from, which has an unhappy *tendency* although it may not in itself be sinful—that is, if it tends to *prepare the way* for forming a bad habit—which leaves an unsalutary moral impression or unhealthy tone of feeling—which looks *downwards* instead of upwards in the path of virtue—which cherishes a propensity of itself sufficiently liable to gain *strength* and take deep root.

It has sometimes appeared to me, that one great reason why we are not influenced more by the *example* of Christ is that we are apt to

exalt him in imagination above the ordinary occurrences and the ten thousand little acts which fill up by far the greater part of every day's account. When engaged in things which seem to be rather trivial matters, we forget to ask ourselves, how would Jesus Christ act if he were now in our situation? and perhaps some would regard it as a profanation of his sacred name, to suffer such an inquiry to obtrude on such occasions, upon our thoughts. But is it so? Is not his religion designed to spread itself over *all* our conduct—to give colour to our minutest acts, and even to our ordinary thoughts, feelings, and purposes; and is not the example of Christ to be constantly contributing a powerful share towards making up this great moral influence—towards transforming us anew, so that we bear the image—of whom? of Christ himself. We are too prone to regard this part, and indeed every part of his religion as designed to operate only while we are passing through the process of conversion, and afterwards only on occasions of importance. Instead of giving an even, beautiful color to the whole web of life, we surround it only with a gaudy fringe and pass here and there across it, some conspicuous streak. How different from this the character of our Saviour! "His doctrines," says Mrs. More, "were so digested into his life, his instructions were so melted into his practice, that it rendered goodness visible as well as perfect."—Yes, visible throughout—not a speck left to obscure the pure and beautiful brilliancy of his character. His religion was the glow of life and health which animates the countenance and shows an all-pervading vivifying principle within. There is no unequal action here. The fever does not rage in one part of the system, while a chill, cold as death is shivering another part. All is one grand and perfect piece.

## THEOLOGICAL COLLECTIONS.

## VIEW OF THE PROGRESS OF DOGMATIC HISTORY.

*Translated for the Christian Spectator, from Muenscher's Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Vol. I. Introd. Pt. v.*

DOGMATIC history is a modern species of composition, scarcely known before the Reformation. In the preceding centuries, an enquiry into the variations and changes in the prevailing creed was never thought of. The opinions of those accounted heretics were described, though generally with too much prejudice and partiality; but the opinions of the catholic Fathers were subjected to examination, only with the view of convicting or acquitting them of the charge of heresy,—as in the case of Origen and the three points;—or they were collected as testimonies in favour of the writer's own opinions. From the high respect for tradition, it was very natural that the testimony of the more eminent Fathers should be often cited, and quotations from them be multiplied, for the purpose of evincing the true doctrines of Christianity. Thus, for instance, while the monophysite controversies were agitated, both Theodoret and Leo the Great made collections of passages relating to the person and the natures of Christ. So in the ecclesiastical councils, it was customary to collect a number of ancient testimonies on the points to be decided, and then to subjoin the decrees of the council. In subsequent ages, the scholastic divines made much use of the writings of the Fathers, particularly of Augustine, and were guided by them in their own enquiries and decisions.

But from all these efforts to exhibit and explain the early opinions of the church, little or nothing was gained to dogmatic history. For it

was always taken for granted, that the views of the church had remained unchanged, and that every departure from her faith was a wicked innovation. All the ecclesiastical councils and the distinguished Fathers were supposed to be entirely at agreement, at least in matters of importance, and their disagreements and contradictions were either winked at, or explained away. Only two persons, so far as I know, are here to be excepted. The monophysite Stephen Gobarus, in the sixth century attempted to make a collection of the doctrines on which the early Fathers held contrary opinions. Of this collection, Photius has preserved a short abstract. A similar attempt seems to have been made, in the twelfth century, by the acute Peter Abelard, in his *Liber sententiarum sic et non*, which has never been published.<sup>a</sup>

The revival of learning, the thirst for knowledge, and the freedom of inquiry, which characterized the fifteenth century, prepared the way,—and the reformation in the sixteenth century produced an urgent demand,—for the cultivation of dogmatic history. The more the reformers were decried as daring innovators, who disturbed the church by advancing opinions before unheard of, the more were they stimulated and roused to defend themselves with historical arguments. They of course eagerly sought for proofs, that the prevailing theology had gradually degenerated and been corrupted, particularly in the middle ages, in consequence of ignorance and superstition. Luther frequently darted a penetrating glance on the history of doctrines; and Melancthon, possessing more erudition, was still better prepared to

<sup>a</sup> See *Histoire Liter. de la France*, tome xii. p. 130, &c.



employ history in support of the protestant faith. Martin Chemnitz, in his Examination of the Council of Trent, shewed himself a man of much reading, of extensive knowledge in history, and of great penetration, which give a permanent value to his works, and may atone for some degree of partiality, and the want at times of better criticism.<sup>b</sup> At length, Matthias Flavius Illyricus, with his coadjutors, crowned the advantages to dogmatic history from the reformation, by the *Centuriæ Magdeburgicæ*,<sup>c</sup> in which much labour is bestowed on the history of doctrines, in a chapter on each century devoted to the subject. This work, notwithstanding the not unfrequent mistakes of the compilers, and its polemic aspect, has thrown far more light on dogmatic history, than could have been expected in a first work of the kind and with so imperfect helps.

The attacks of the Protestants upon the Catholics, with historic arguments, roused the Catholic clergy, and obliged them to study ecclesiastical history with more care, in order to defend their church. Cardinal Cæsar Baronius,<sup>d</sup> who led the way, though his insufficiency in knowledge and his partialities led him into numberless misstatements, has the merit of bringing to light many records before unknown, and

giving new explanations of several points of doctrine.

Thus the contest between Protestants and Catholics it was, that first called attention to the changes in matters of faith, and put the learned on both sides upon efforts to investigate the subject. But there arose other controversies, which increased the interest, and widened the range of these investigations. Not only were the Protestants divided among themselves on several points, but there arose among them Anti-Trinitarians, who thought they must reject some doctrines of the common faith, which the Protestants had spared. All these contending parties, maintained, that their own distinguishing tenets coincided with the doctrines of the primitive churches; and all laboured to prove this coincidence, by means of history, though evidently in a partial and defective mode of reasoning.

In the *seventeenth* and beginning of the *eighteenth* centuries, less was done in Germany than in some other countries, to advance the history of religious doctrines. John Gerhard was well read, and a learned collector; but with him history was entirely subordinate to polemics.<sup>e</sup> George Calixtus possessed a generous mind, and true historical learning; but being involved in unhappy theological quarrels, he could elucidate only certain parts of doctrinal history.<sup>f</sup> Several elementary works on the history of doctrines, scarcely deserve notice, as they were deficient in all the requi-

<sup>b</sup>. *Examen Concilii Tridentini*, 1565-73, 4 vol. 8 vo. best ed. Francof. ad Moenum 1707. Fol. Also in his *Locis Theologicis*, ed. opera Polyr. Lyseri. 1610. Fol.

<sup>c</sup>. *Ecclesiastica Historia per aliquot pios et studiosos viros in urbe Madeburgica*. Basil, 1559--74, 13 tomi, Fol. Also abridged somewhat Basil, 1624, 13 tomi in 3 Fol. The ed. of Semler, 1757--65, 4 to. was never completed.

<sup>d</sup>. *Annales Ecclesiasticæ*, Romæ 1588--1607, 12 vol. Fol. The most convenient ed. is that with Pagi Critica, and full Indices, Venet. 1738--42, 13 vol. Fol. But the latest, with Raynold's Continuation, is by Mansi, Luccæ 1738--59. 38 vol. Fol.

<sup>e</sup>. *Confessio Catholica*, 1633, 4 to. *Loci Theologici*, 1657, 3 tomi, Fol.—and much enlarged, especially in the historical parts, by J. F. Cotta. 1762--89, 22 vol. 4 to.

<sup>f</sup>. *e. g.* *Historia de statu rerum in Eccles. Occid. sæcul. viii--x.* inserted in his *Apparatus Theologicus*. 1661. 4 to. and *Essays: de Persona Christi: de Misse Sacrificio: &c.*

sites of a good history. *g* Balthazar Bebelius made a compilation, on the four first centuries, which is of some use. *h* In the beginning of the eighteenth century, J. F. Buddeus at Jena, and C. M. Pfaff at Tübingen, not only published various essays on subjects in dogmatic history, but also interspersed historical remarks and illustrations in their dogmatical works. *i* Many other learned Germans, about the same period, published more or fewer works illustrating the history of particular doctrines. Of this class were Thomas Ittig, *j* John Chr. Wolf, *k* Sal. Deyling, *l* Chr. Aug. Salig, *m* Siegm. J. Baumgarten, *n* John Aug. Dietelmaier, *o* and John Geo. Walch. *p*

In the Swiss church, John Oeco-

*g.* Loci Theologici e Patribus, &c. per Urb. Rhegium 1545. M. Neandri Theologia Christiana S. S. Patrum &c. 1595. 4 to. H. Eckhard: Compend. Theologiae Patrum, 1606-1622. 8 vo. J. G. Baieri Compend. Theol. Histor. 1699. 8 vo.

*h.* Antiquitates Ecclesiae in tribus post C. natum saeculis. 1669. 4 to. And Antiqq. Eccles. in quarto. p. C. natum saeculo. 1679-80. 2 vol. 4 to.

*i.* Buddei Instit. Theol. Dogmat. 1723, and 1741. 4 to. Pfaff: Institutt. Theol. Dogmat. et Moralis, 1720. 8 vo.

*j.* Hist. Eccles. primi. saeculi Selecta Capita. 1709, secundi saeculi, 1711. 4 to.

*k.* Manichaeisimus ante Manichaeum, Hamb. 1707. 8 vo.

*l.* Observationum sacrar. et miscellan. Partes V. ed. 3. Lips. 1735-48.

*m.* De Eutychnismo ante Eutychem. 1723. 4 to.

*n.* Historia Doctrinae de Statu animarum separatar. 1754—and other Disertations.

*o.* Historia Dogmatis de descensu Christi ad Inferos. ed. 2. 1762. 8 vo. —Commenti Fanatici ἀποκαταστάσεως πατρων Historia antiquior. 1769. 8 vo.

*p.* Miscellanea Sacra, 1744 [contains useful histories of Original Sin, Transubstantiation, Infant Baptism, Pelagianism, the Lollards, &c.]—Historia controversiae de Processione Sp. Sancti, 1751. 8 vo.

lampadius, *q* early applied history to the confutation of Luther's doctrine concerning the Lord's supper; and Henry Bullinger, *r* to confute the peculiar doctrines of the Catholics. Afterwards Ludov. Lavater, *s* Rud. Hospinian, *t* and John J. Hottinger, *u* attempted to elucidate doctrines by history.

In France, during the same period, much more was done than in Germany. The Catholics and Reformed were martiailed against each other, and illustrated Christian antiquities with untiring assiduity, and sometimes with much skill and discernment; for not only the ardour of combat, but solicitude for their respective churches quickened their diligence. On the side of the Reformed, stood forth Philip de Mornay, *v* Edmund Aubertin, *w* and David Blondel. *x* On the same side, Daniel Chamier *y* enriched his polemics from the armoury of history. But John Daille *z* eclipsed all his party by his intimate knowledge of the Fathers, whom he employed with great adroitness against the Catholics. John Claude *a* likewise gained not a

*q.* Dialogus, quid de Eucharistia veteres tum Graeci tum Latini senserunt. 1530. and 1590.

*r.* De origine Erroris, Libri II. 1529. 8 vo.—1539 4 to.—1568. Fol.

*s.* Historia de origine atque progr. controversiae sacramentar. 1564, and 1672. 8 vo.

*t.* Historia Sacramentaria, 1598. 1602, 1681. 2 vol. Fol.

*u.* Fata doctrinae de Praedestinatione et gratia Dei salutar, 1627. 4to.

*v.* De sacra Eucharistia, (in Fr. 1598.) in Lat. 1605. Fol.

*w.* De Eucharistiae Sacramento, Libri III. 1654. Fol.

*x.* Eclaircisemens familiers de la controverse de l'Eucharistie, 1641. Traite de la creance des S. Pères touchant l'état des ames apres la mort. 1651.

*y.* Panstratiae Catholicae, sive controversiarum contra Pontificios corpus, 1629. Fol. The 5th vol. was published by J. H. Alsted, after the author's death.

little credit, by the ability and eloquence with which he stated the history of the Eucharist.

Against these, the Catholics could oppose men of equal learning, and of no less ability in dogmatic history; namely, James Sirmond,<sup>b</sup> John Launoy,<sup>c</sup> Anthony Arnaud,<sup>d</sup> Daniel Huet,<sup>e</sup> and others. The Jesuit, Denys Petau (Dionysius Petavius)<sup>f</sup> attempted to embrace the whole compass of dogmatic history in a single work, which, though unfinished, is of permanent value as a collection of materials; but it lacks arrangement and impartiality, and is little more than a series of extracts from the Fathers and the scholastics. What is commonly regarded as his fault,—namely, his representing the doctrinal views of the early Fathers as indistinct,—should be reckoned among his excellencies. A work on the same plan, though not of equal merit with that of Petau, was attempted by Lewis Thomassin, a presbyter of the Oratory.<sup>g</sup> The

celebrated bishop of Meaux, James Benignus Bossuet,<sup>h</sup> endeavoured craftily to turn upon the assailants the historical weapons, which the Protestants so often wielded against the Catholics; but found in the reformed theologian, James Basnage,<sup>i</sup> an able and eloquent opponent. Many learned Frenchmen contributed to perfect the sources of dogmatic history, by their valuable editions of the Fathers, accompanied with notes, and often with essays on the doctrinal views of the Fathers. These editors never shew any want of diligence; but they too often betray their prejudices and partiality. The names of Henry de Valois (Valesius,) Stephen Baluze, Michael le Quien, John and Julius Garnier, Renatus Massuet, Anthony Augustus Toutte, Prudentius Maran, Bernhard de Montfaucon, and others, will ever be remembered by readers of the Fathers with gratitude. Several works of ecclesiastical history, likewise, contributed much to dogmatic history. Sebastian le Nain de Tillemont<sup>j</sup> made a collection of documents for the history of the six first centuries, which bears undeniable marks of the forty years' labour bestowed upon it. Lewis Ellis Dupin<sup>k</sup> ventured to criticise

<sup>a.</sup> *De Usu Patrum*, 1656. 4to. [also in English, 1675. 4to.]—*De Patrum fide circa imagines*, 1642. 8vo. *De Poenis et Satisfactionibus humanis*, 1649. 4to. *Adversus Latinorum, de Cultus relig. Objecto, traditionem*, 1664. 4to. *De cultibus Latinor, religiosis*, 1671.—*De confirmatione et extrema unctione*, 1659. 4 to. *De Confessione auriculari*, 1661. 4 to.—*Replique aux deux livres, que Adam et Cottibry ont publies contra lui*, 1662. 4 to.

<sup>a.</sup> *Reponse au livre de M. Arnaud, intitule la Perpetuite, &c.* 1670.

<sup>b.</sup> *Opera varia*, 1696 and 1728. 5 tomi, Fol.—especially the 4th volume.

<sup>c.</sup> *Opera omnia*, 1735. 5 tomi, Fol.

<sup>d.</sup> *Tradition de l'Eglise sur le sujet de penitence et la communion*, ed. 5 me. 1700. 8vo.—Probably also: *La perpetuite de la foi de l'Eglise catholique touchant l'Eucharistie*, 1670–72. 3 tomes, 4 to: to which Renat. Renaudot added a fourth and a fifth volume, 1711–13.

<sup>e.</sup> His valuable, *Origeniana*.—still more the fourth volume of the *Works of Origen*, edition of De la Rue.

<sup>f.</sup> *Opus de theologicis dogmatibus*, 1645–50. 5 tomi, Fol.—enlarged and improved by Theoph. Alethinus (J. le

Clerc,) 6 tomi. Fol.—and Florentiae, 1757. 7 tomi.—The 1st. volume treats of God; the second of the Trinity; the third of Angels, Creation, and Pelagianism; the fourth of the Hierarchy, Priesthood, Consecrations and Penance; the fifth and sixth, of the Incarnation of Christ.

<sup>g.</sup> *Dogmata Theologica*, Paris 1600–39. 3 tomi, Fol.

<sup>h.</sup> *Histoire des Variations des Eglises protestants*; best ed. 1734. 4 vol. 12 mo. Also in English.

<sup>i.</sup> *Histoire de l'Eglise Depuis Jesus Christ*, Rotterd. 1699, and à la Haye, 1723. 2 vol. Fol.—The second vol. gives the history of opinions respecting the Canon, Tradition, Grace, and the Eucharist.

<sup>j.</sup> *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclesiastique des six premiers siecles*, 1693–1712. 16 tomes, 4 to.



the authors whose history and works he describes, so freely, that notwithstanding his guarded manner, he drew on himself the censure of his Catholic friends. And the Dominican, Natalis Alexander,*l* who often inserts in his church history entire essays on the history of doctrines, could not atone, with the popes and their supporters, for his declarations concerning the rights of the Gallican churches, by all the zeal with which he combats the opinions of Daille and other Protestants.

In Italy there was in general more devotedness to the papal throne, and more caution not to yield any point, however trivial, to the Protestants. Yet from them, dogmatic history received very considerable advantage. Leo Allazzi (Allatius)*m* was a diligent, though not impartial compiler. Henry Norris*n* earned higher commendations, notwithstanding his researches were limited to the horizon of an Augustan monk, Joseph Maria Thomasi,*o* Scipio Maffei;*p* and still more, Joseph Simon Assemani,*q* John Lamy,*r* Lewis Ant. Mu-

ratori,*s* and Peter and Hieronimus Ballerini,*t* deserve notice.

In the Low Countries, the history of doctrines was not neglected. Gerhard John Vossius*u* excelled all his cotemporaries in historical learning, of which his history of Pelagianism is a standing memorial. And his friend, Hugo Grotius,*v* on one occasion, shewed that he was no stranger to this kind of learning. Henry Alting*w* treated of these four subjects:—the state of theology, the Holy Scriptures, the Unity of God, and the Trinity: but the work is superficial and imperfect. Frederick Spanheim, the younger,*x* both in his Ecclesiastical History, and in various Essays, has contributed not a little to dogmatic history. The two Basnages, James*y* and Samuel*z* were Frenchmen by birth, but lived in Holland. John Caspar Suiur*a* composed a valuable help to understand the language and opinions of the Greek Fathers. The learned and communicative Arminian, John le Clerc,*b* had courage to lift the veil, which even the Protestants were wont to throw around the errors and weaknesses of the ancient church, and vivaciously to show how much the most

*k* Nouvelle Bibliotheque des auteurs ecclesiastiques, 1636—1714. 47 tomes, 8vo.

*l* Historia Eccles. V. et N. Test. 1690, &c. 8 vol. Fol.—13 vol. 4 to. 9 vol. Fol.

*m* De Ecclesiae occidentalis et orientalis perpetua Consensione, Libri III. 1643. 4 to.—Græciæ orthodoxæ, tomi II. 1652—59.

*n* Opera. 1729—32. 4 tomi, Fol. [contain: History of Pelagianism.]

*o* Institutiones theologicae antiquorum Patrum, 1709—12, 3 tomi 8vo.—This anonymous work is not what its title imports; but is merely a correct edition of some of the principal dogmatic, moral and polemic works of the Fathers.

*p* Istoria theologica delle doctrine della grazia, del libero arbitrio e della predestinatione, 1742. Fol. [also in Latin, by Reiffenberg, 1756. Fol.]

*q* Bibliotheca Orientalis, tomi I. II. 1719—21 tomi III. Pars I. et 2. 1725—28. Fol.

*r* De recta Christianorum in eo, quod mysterium Trinitatis adinet, sententia, 1733.

*s* Liturgia Romana vetus. 1748, 2 tomi, Fol. Antiquitates Italiae medii ævi.

*t* Learned additions to the works of H. Norris.—Works of Leo the Great, &c.

*u* Operum tomus VI. opera theologica complectens. 1701. Fol.

*v* In his work: De Satisfactione Christi, contra F. Socinum.

*w* Theologia Historica, Amstel. 1664. 4 to.

*x* Opera, Lugd. 1701, 3 tomi Fol. The historical works are in vol. 1st and 2d.

*y* See note *j*.

*z* Annales politico-eccles: a Caesare Aug. ad Phocam usque. 1706. 3 tomi, Fol.

*a* Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, ex Patribus Gr. collectus. 1682 and 1726. 2 tomi, Fol.

distinguished Fathers failed in exegesis, and how often they were betrayed into fantastic thoughts and empty declamation. Another learned Arminian, Adrian von Cattenberg,<sup>c</sup> in his supplement to Limborch's Theology, has collected many historical elucidations of doctrines; which however, seem rather derived from other compilations than from the original sources.—Finally, Hermann Venema,<sup>d</sup> has interspersed in his Ecclesiastical History, frequent remarks on the state and vicissitudes of opinion, which evince erudition and freedom of thought, though his prolix work is lacking in taste and good arrangement.

In Great Britain, the contests between Episcopalians and Presbyterians have led to elaborate investigations respecting the ancient church; and from these, dogmatic history derived some advantages. The famous archbishop Usher, did not indeed compose a general dogmatic history,<sup>e</sup> but he investigated several parts of it.<sup>f</sup> The Scotch bishop, John Forbes of Corse,<sup>g</sup> is the only Reformed writer, that has attempted to compose a general dogmatic history. Such an undertaking, Forbes has the merit of accomplishing, with learning and diligence; yet on the assumed principle, that the opinions of the Reformed churches were in perfect accordance with

Christian antiquity. Various particular doctrines have been treated of, by John Cosin,<sup>h</sup> John Pearson,<sup>i</sup> Peter Allix,<sup>j</sup> a Frenchman naturalized in England, Peter King,<sup>k</sup> George Bull,<sup>l</sup> Daniel Whitby,<sup>m</sup> Samuel Clarke,<sup>n</sup> William Wall,<sup>o</sup> Nathaniel Lardner,<sup>p</sup> and others. The more recent work of the famous dissenter Joseph Priestly,<sup>q</sup> entitled a History of the Corruptions of Christianity,—from the name of the author, has excited more attention, than its shallow contents and its glaring ignorance of the sources of historic knowledge would justify.

The anti-Trinitarians may be allowed a place here, since they have prosecuted dogmatic history according to their own creed, for which they claim historical evidence. To this class belong David Zwicker,<sup>r</sup> Christopher Sand,<sup>s</sup>

<sup>g</sup> Institutiones historico-theologiae, de Doctrina Christiana, 1745, and constituting the second volume of his Works 1703. 2tomi, Fol.

<sup>h</sup> Historia Transubstantionis, Lond. 1675.

<sup>i</sup> Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. Lond. 1659. Fol.

<sup>j</sup> In a series of historical works, on the Trinity. [See a list of them in Rees' Cycl.]

<sup>k</sup> The History of the Apostles' Creed. Lond. 1702. 8vo.

<sup>l</sup> Opera, ed. J. Ern. Grabe, Lond. 1703. Fol. [on the doctrine of the Trinity.]

<sup>m</sup> Disquisitiones modestæ in Bulli Defensionem fidei Nicaenae. 1724.—Tractatus de Imputatione peccati Adami, 1711.—Dissert. de S. Scripturarum interpretatione, secundum Patrum Commentarios. 1714.

<sup>n</sup> The scripture doctrine of the Trinity. Lond. 1712. 8vo.

<sup>o</sup> History of infant Baptism. Lond. 1705. 2vols. 8vo.

<sup>p</sup> Credibility of the Gospel History. 1717—60. 17 vols. 8vo.

<sup>q</sup> History of the Corruptions of Christianity, [Boston 1797. 2vol. 12mo]—History of early opinions—proving that the Christian church was at first Unitarian. 1786. 4vol. 8vo.

<sup>r</sup> Irenicum Irenicorum. Amstel. 1658. 12mo.—Irenico mastix. 1661.

<sup>b</sup> In his biographical writings in the Bibliothéque universelle; and in the Epistolæ Criticae, annexed to his Ars Critica, 1712.

<sup>c</sup> Spicilegium Theologiae Philippi a Limborch. Amstel. 1726. Fol.

<sup>d</sup> Institutiones Historiæ Eceles. Vet. et N. Test. 1777—83. 7tomi 4to.

<sup>e</sup> We often see quoted: Jac. Usserii Historia Dogmatum; as if it were a general work. But the true title is: Historia Dogmatica Controversiae de Scripturis, et Sacris vernaculis. Lond. 1690. 4to.

<sup>f</sup> Here belong, the work just mentioned; and the investigations concerning the Pelagians, in his Antiqq. Ecclesiar. Britanicae. 1639. 4to.—Historia Gotteschalci. 1631. 4to.—An answer to a challenge made by a Jesuit. &c.

Souverain,<sup>t</sup> Samuel Crell,<sup>u</sup> and William Whiston;<sup>v</sup> though they did not all hold the same opinions. The work of Joseph Priestly, already mentioned, likewise belongs here.

However great the labour bestowed on dogmatic history since the reformation—however rich the collections of materials—and however critically certain doctrines may have been illustrated; yet all these labours and efforts are of the less value, because they were undertaken for controversial purposes.—Dogmatic history was viewed as an armory, from which every one expected to derive weapons for defending his own church, and for assaulting all others. Hence it was, that only those doctrines received much attention, which were in controversy at the time, either between Catholics and Protestants, or between both and the anti-Trinitarians, or between the different sects of Protestants. Another misfortune was, that the partialities of the investigators and compilers led them to represent the Fathers as harmonizing precisely with their own opinions; and sometimes—perhaps unconsciously—to put artificial or forced constructions upon the writings of the ancients. As all parties, Catholics, Protestants, and anti-Trinitarians, pursued such a course; it is not strange, that they arrived at very different results.

These earlier works in dogmatic history were likewise imperfect, because many documents essentially affecting several doctrines, were unknown to the writers, having been gradually brought to light in

modern times; and because historic criticism was then imperfect, so that spurious writings were sometimes taken for genuine; and finally, because the excellence of a work on dogmatic history, was supposed to consist rather in the accumulation of testimonies from ancient authors, than in a lucid and correct exposition of the progress of opinion.

The honour of leading the way to a freer and more independent method of composing dogmatic histories, and thus of making an epoch in this species of writing, belongs to John Solomon Semler. At an earlier period, indeed, Godfrey Arnold,<sup>x</sup> had combatted the common prejudice, even among Protestants, of excessive reverence for the ancient Christian church and its articles of faith: and Isaac Beausobre,<sup>y</sup> had published a rich treasury of new and valuable remarks on the history of the ancient doctrines and heresies. John Lawrence von Mosheim,<sup>z</sup> who first wrote church history with good taste, was equally a benefactor to dogmatic history, by his numerous and valuable illustrations of it. But Semler it was, who first broke through many prepossessions that had hitherto marred the works on dogmatic history, and who fully disclosed the undeniable fact, that the faith of Christians suffered various changes even in the first centuries,

<sup>w</sup> Unpartheyische Kirchen, und Ketzer historie, 1699--1700. 2 vol. Fol.---best ed. Schafhäuser, 1740--42. 3 vol. Fol.

<sup>x</sup> Histoire critique de Manichee et du Manicheisme, 1734--39. 2 vol. 4 to.---a work which embraces much more than the title expresses.

<sup>y</sup> Institutionum Historiae Eccles. Libri IV. Helmst. 1755. 4to. [translated into Eng. by Maclaine, and often reprinted.] Still more: in Commentarii de Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum. Helmst. 1753. 4to. [also translated into English.]---and in: Dissertationes ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes. Altonæ 1743. 2 vol. 8 vo.

<sup>z</sup> Nucleus Historiae Ecclesiasticæ. 1676. 4to.—Appendix. 1678.

<sup>t</sup> Le Platonisme dévoilé, ou Essai touchant le Verbe Platonicien. 1700. 8vo.

<sup>u</sup> Lucae Mellier (Sam. Crell) Fides primorum Christianorum, (against Bp. Bull's defence,) 1697. 8vo.

<sup>v</sup> Primitive Christianity revived. Lond. 1711--12. 5vol. 8vo.



that it was shaped differently in different countries, and gradually, and for the most part from external and accidental causes, obtained a more definite and established form. His familiar acquaintance with the sources of history, enabled him to bring together stores of materials, and his clear, critical discernment led him to many new views and remarks; which however, he seldom took time fully to examine, and never, to arrange and state in a lucid manner. If his censures of the ancient Fathers, are sometimes too strong,—his criticism of the genuineness of ancient writings, too distrustful,—or if his too frequent repetition of certain favourite notions, and the negligence of his style, make him tedious; yet these imperfections are balanced by the fullness of his reading, his learned elucidations of ecclesiastical philology, and his free and uncontroulled judgments.<sup>a</sup>

Cotemporary with Semler, was John Aug. Ernesti,<sup>b</sup> who forcibly recommended the study of historical theology, and illustrated some points of it, with a deep knowledge of languages and of antiquities.—John Andrew Cramer<sup>c</sup> not only treated many important points of dogmatic history, more clearly than had been done before, but his investigations cast new light on the theology of the middle ages. C. W. F. Walch,<sup>d</sup> though like Cramer

he could not free himself from somewhat narrow theological views, was a pattern of cautious and thorough investigation. John Matthias Schroeckk,<sup>e</sup> in his copious church history, describes the state and revolutions of opinion with special care, and with that impartiality which is so great an excellence of his work. G. L. Lessing,<sup>f</sup> by his very deep penetration, would probably have surpassed all the writers of doctrinal history, had he left us something more than his fragments and hints on the subject.

C. F. Roessler<sup>g</sup> followed successfully Semler's course. Though he did not complete his compilations and investigations respecting the state and progress of ancient theology, yet his works every where display philological and historical learning, united with accuracy and impartiality. As Roessler collected and prepared materials for early dogmatic history, so G. J. Planck<sup>h</sup>

<sup>b</sup> German translation and continuation of Bossuet's *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, by J. A. Cramér. 1759—86. 8vol. 8vo.

<sup>c</sup> *Entwurf einer vollstaendigen Historie der Ketzereyen*. u. s. w. 1762—85. 11vol. 8vo.—*Kritische Untersuchung vom Gebrauche der heiligen Schrift in d. 3 ersten Jahrh.* 1779. 8vo.

<sup>d</sup> *Christliche Kirchengeschichte*. 1768—1812. 45vol. 8vo.—[the last vol by Tzschirner.]

<sup>e</sup> *Berengarius Turonensis*. 1770. 4to.—*Theologischer Nachlass*. 1784. 8vo.

<sup>f</sup> *Lehrbegriff der christliche Kirche in den ersten drey Jahrhunderten*. 1775. 8vo.—*Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, in Uebersetz. u. Auszugen. 1776—87. 10vol. 8vo.—Several smaller works of his.—G. D. Fuch's *Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen*. 1780—84. 4 vol. 8vo. is a suitable accompaniment to Roessler's *Bibliothek*.

<sup>g</sup> *Geschichte der Entstehung, der Veraenderungen und der Bildung unsers protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, von der Reformation bis zur Einfuehrung der Concordienformel*. Leipz. 1781—1800. 6vol. 8vo.

<sup>a</sup> See his: *Selecta capita Historiæ Eccles.* 1767--69. 3vol. 8 vo.—*Commentarii historici de antiquo Christianorum statu*, tom. 1. et tom. 2di P. I. Hallæ 1771-72. 8vo.—his historical Introduction to Theology, prefixed to Baumgarten's *Evangelischer Glaubenslehre*, 1759-60. 3 vol. 4to.—and still more, the continuation of it, prefixed to Baumgarten's *Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten*, 1762-64. 3 vol. 4 to.

<sup>a</sup> *De Theologiæ historiæ et dogmaticæ conjungendæ necessitate*: in his *Opuscula Theologica*, 1773 and 1792. Also: *Opuscula Philol. Critica*, 1764—and here and there, in der neuen u. neuester theologischen Bibliothek.

showed by example, that a history of protestant opinions may be written in a truly philosophic manner and without bias. Since their day, various learned men have given attention to this department. J. F. Gaal *i* wrote an epitome of dogmatic history, and illustrations of the first centuries of it. C. G. Heinrich, *j* in describing the variations in the manner of teaching theology, made good use of the previous labours of others, without going to the original sources. The history of dogmatics, to the time of the reformation, is included in C. W. Flügge's *k* history of theological science. S. G. Lange *l* commenced a large work, on the entire of ancient dogmatic history in the order of time. J. C. F. Wundemann *m* composed a dogmatic history, extending from the fourth to the sixth century. Some other recent works are no acquisition to the department. Yet the Danish work of Fr. Muentner, *n* though not yet finished, deserves honourable notice.

Much greater is the list of works, in which certain parts and subjects

*i* Erste Linien zu einer Geschichte der Dogmatik. 1787.—Abhandlungen zur Dogmengeschichte der ältesten griechischen Kirche bis auf die Zeiten des Clemens von Alexandrien. Jena. 1790. 8vo.

*j* Versuch einer Geschichte der verschiedenen Lehrarten der christlichen Glaubenswahrheiten, und der merkwürdigsten Systeme und Compendien derselben. 1790. 8vo.

*k* Versuch einer Geschichte der theologischen Wissenschaften, 1796—98. 3vol. 8vo.—Also his, Einleitung in die Gesch. d. theologischen Wissenschaften. 1799. 8vo.

*l* Ausführliche Gesch. der Dogmen, u. s. w. erster Theil (down to Irenaeus) 1796, 8 vo.

*m* Geschichte der christlichen Glaubenslehren vom Zeitalter des Athanasius bis auf Gregor. den Grönen, 1798-99, 2 vol. 8 vo.

*n* Haandbog i den ældste chr. Kirkes Dogmehistorie, vol. 1. 1801-8. [This work is now completed, and translated into German, 1802, 3 vol, in 2, 8 vo.]

Vol. I.—No. V.

of dogmatic history are investigated and explained. Though all of them cannot be noticed here, yet we must not pass in silence the meritorious labours of J. A. Stark, *o* W. A. Teller, *p* J. G. Rosenmüller, *q* C. A. T. Keil, *r* C. W. L. Ziegler, *s* J. F. Loeffler, *t* Henry Corodi, *u* and C. D. Martini. *v*

Likewise the authors of the recent and valuable church histories. H. P. C. Henke, *w* and J. E. C. Schimdt, *x* have had constant regard to the origin and progress of opinions.—Sketches of dogmatic history are also included in various modern works on dogmatics, and especially in the elementary works of G. F. Seiler, *y* J. F. Gruner, *z*

*o* Freymuethige Betrachtungen ueber das Christenthum, 1782.—It was answered by Hegelmaier, Tueb. 1781-82, 3 Stucke, 8 vo.—Versuch einer Geschichte des Arianismus, 1783, 2 vol. 8 vo.—Gesch. der Taufen. d. Taufgesinnten, 1789.

*p*

*q* De Christianae Theologiae origine Liber. 1786.—Historia Interpretationis libror. Sac. in Ecclesia Christ. inde ab Apost. aetate usque ad Originem, P. I, II, 1795-98.

*r* De Doctoribus veteris Ecclesiae, culpa corruptae per Platonicas sententias Theologiae, liberandis, commentatio I—XI, 1793—1801.

*s* Geschichtsentwicklung des Dogma von dem heilige Geiste, 1791.

*t* German translation of Souverain's Platonisme dévoilé, with notes, 1792

*u* Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Gesch. des juedischen u. christl. Bibelkanon's, 2 Bde.

*v* Versuch einer pragmatischen Geschichte des Dogma von der Gottheit Christi in den vier ersten Jahrh. nach Christi Geburt, 1 ter Theil, 1801, 8 vo.

*w* Allgemeine Geschichte der christl. Kirche [continued by Vater to 1800, 9 vol. 8 vo.]

*x* Handbuch der christl. Kirchengeschichte, [1801-20, 6 vol. 8 vo.—reaching to the reformation.]

*y* Theologia dogmatico-polemica cum compendio Historiae Dogmatum, ed. 3, Erlang, 1789.

*z* Institutionum Theologiae dogmaticae Libri III. Hallae 1777.

J. C. Doederlein,<sup>a</sup> C. F. Staudlin,<sup>b</sup> and C. D. Beck.<sup>c</sup>

But notwithstanding all that has been done, the history of doctrines needs to be wrought and illustrated more perfectly; and this perhaps—since the importance of the department is now generally admitted, and as the interest in it appears increasing—may be expected from the very next generation of theologians.

#### HOOKE'S OPINION OF CALVIN.

"A FOUNDER it [the Geneva church-discipline] had, whom, for mine own part, I think incomparably the wisest man that ever the French church did enjoy, since the hour it enjoyed him. His bringing up was in the study of the civil law. Divine knowledge he gathered not by hearing or reading, so much as by teaching others. For though thousands were debtors to him, as touching knowledge in that kind, yet he to none but only to God, the author of that most blessed fountain, the Book of Life, and of the admirable dexterity of wit; together with the helps of other learning which were his guides."

"Two things of principal moment there are which have deservedly procured him honour throughout the world; the one, his exceeding pains in composing the institutions of Christian Religion; the other, his no less industrious travels for exposition of Holy Scripture, according to the same institutions. In which two things, who,

<sup>a</sup> *Institutio Theologi Christiani*, ed. 6, 1799, 2 vol. 8 vo.

<sup>b</sup> *Dogmatik und Dogmengeschichte*, 1800, 2 vol.—*Lehrbuch der Dogmatik und Dogmengeschichte*, 1801, 8 vo.

<sup>c</sup> *Commentarii historici decretorum religionis Christianae et Formulae Lutheriae*, 1801, 8 vo.

soever they were that after him bestowed their labour, he gained the advantage of prejudice against them, if they gainsayed; and of glory above them, if they consented. His writings, published after the question about that discipline was once begun, omit not any the least occasion of extolling the use and singular necessity thereof. Of what account the master of sentences was in the church of Rome, the same and more amongst the preachers of reformed churches, Calvin had purchased; so that the perfectest divines were judged they, which were skilfullest in Calvin's writings; his books almost the very canon to judge both doctrine and discipline by."—*Preface to Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity*.

Thus far the 'judicious Hooker,' many of whose great admirers at the present day can find no theme so fruitful of discourse, as the "dreadful errors of Calvinism." I will add the opinion of another of the English prelates respecting Calvin, since it happens to be lying at hand on my table.

"Nothing indeed can more satisfactorily evince the high estimation to which the commentaries of Calvin are still entitled from the Biblical student, than the following eulogium of one of the most learned prelates that ever adorned the Anglican church—Bishop Horsley. "I hold," says he, "the memory of Calvin in high veneration: his works have a place in my library; and in the study of the Holy Scriptures, he is one of the commentators whom I most frequently consult." The writer of these pages has not often had occasion to refer to the writings of Calvin in the prosecution of this work; yet he has never consulted them but with advantage and pleasure."—*Horne's Introduction*, Vol. II. p. 748.



## REVIEWS.

*Eulogies on Adams and Jefferson.*  
(Continued.)

HAVING already offered our opinion at considerable length, upon the general and comparative literary merits of the encomiastical selection before us, and disposed of two or three other topics which fell directly under our supervision as *Christian Spectators*, we shall now invite the attention of our readers to some of the more vital principles of this splendid and popular volume. It is too late, we think, for anybody to question, that in the common acceptance of the term, Adams and Jefferson were *great* men. They were endowed by nature, with uncommon intellectual strength, forecast, and penetration. They enjoyed the best advantages of education which the country sixty years ago could afford; and they appear to have done themselves great justice, in the early improvement of their talents and opportunities. Mr. Adams was a deep thinker, an earnest, business-like speaker, and a nervous, philosophic writer. Mr. Jefferson was not only a philosopher, but a polite scholar; and they both came forward into public life, at a crisis most favourable for the development and exercise of their uncommon powers.

Of the merits, or demerits, the policy or impolicy, of their respective administrations we have almost nothing to say. Neither was absolutely perfect; under both the country prospered. But of their patriotism and revolutionary services, we have no hesitation in speaking freely, though our limits will compel us to speak briefly. It admits not of a doubt with us, that they were both ardent lovers of their country;—and unwavering and incorruptible friends of her republic-

an institutions. Stronger proofs of a high and almost chivalrous patriotism cannot be demanded, than they uniformly exhibited, as members of the old Congress, and in all their foreign diplomatic agencies, during the revolutionary struggle. To them, greatly, though not perhaps more than to some of their illustrious compeers, are these United States indebted, under Providence, for the undisputed enjoyment of the richest civil and political blessings.

That Adams and Jefferson were both entitled to a high rank as statesmen, might easily be proved by a reference to their revolutionary services, in the councils of the confederation, at home, and in the cabinets of foreign powers, without looking at the measures of either when subsequently placed at the head of the Federal Government. Both their official and less public writings abundantly prove, that they had studied the rights of man, and the principles of civil government deeply; and the experience of more than half a century has added its sanction to most of their early political speculations. In the shades of retirement, particularly during the last ten years of their lives, they were regarded with increasing veneration by the American people; and though the frosts of almost a century had whitened their locks, and chilled the current of life within them, it would seem that nothing could abate the ardour of their patriotism, or diminish the interest which they had so long cherished in the freedom and prosperity of their country.

When such men die, an enlightened and grateful people will speak of their services; and it would, we confess, exceedingly alarm us, to see them go down unheeded with

the common multitude to the grave. For should such an apathy ever pervade the public mind, it would be ominous of extreme danger to our republican institutions. Let those then, who have ably and faithfully served their country, receive their reward in the gratitude of many generations. Let their virtues and public usefulness be recorded, and even commemorated, to keep alive the spirit of independence, and transmit its invaluable blessings to posterity. But let every memorial and every celebration, be characterized by republican simplicity and Christian moderation. Let things be called by their right names; and let not principles and actions be confounded, which are widely different, both in their nature and tendencies.

When a man dies, who has been distinguished for any valuable trait of character, or extraordinary course of public usefulness, let his friends and admirers be satisfied with the meed of commendation which he has fairly earned, without boasting of services which he never rendered, or claiming for him virtues which there is no satisfactory evidence that he ever possessed. To identify piety with love of country, or to infer that any departed public benefactor was a good Christian, because he possessed great talents, or because he was an eminent statesman, or a warm and incorruptible patriot, is as unscriptural, and as contrary to experience, as it would be to argue, that a great statesman must necessarily abound in all the tender charities of private life, or that a distinguished mathematician must of course be a great general, or an ardent friend of republican institutions. These are points not to be *assumed*, but like every thing else, to be *proved* by the proper evidence. We have, to say the most, no better right to infer the coexistence of piety with extraordinary intellectual endow-

ments, in the chair of state, than with common talents, in a private station. The talented advocate of his country's rights in a foreign court, or the brave defender of them in the "tented field," may be at the same time, either the friend or the enemy of God, may be "seeking for glory and honour and immortality" above, or be groveling among the "beggary elements" of this world—may be "fighting the good fight of faith," or marching onward to perdition. In regard to meetness for heaven, worldly estimation and applause prove nothing. That noble daring which breaks its fetters and hurls them in defiance at the oppressor, proves nothing. Even the longest life spent in the public service proves nothing, because there are so many worldly and selfish motives which are known to be sufficient of themselves to secure official integrity, especially in high and honourable stations to the very last hour.

We feel it to be our duty as Christian Spectators, to insist the more earnestly on this point, because, if we mistake not, it is becoming more and more fashionable in certain quarters, entirely to overlook all the scriptural qualifications for a happy immortality, and to send our distinguished revolutionary patriots one after another to heaven, almost as a matter of course. The recollection of our readers will doubtless furnish them with many examples, in fourth-of-July orations, which they have heard, and the obituary notices which have fallen under their observation. We object to these public and uncalled for effusions of charity, on several accounts. In the first place, most of them are entirely gratuitous. Not a syllable of proof is even offered to justify them, aside from what military, civil, and political services can furnish. How inadequate these are,

we have already briefly shown. In the second place, no human persuasion, however confidently expressed, that all is well with departed patriots and sages, can make the least difference in their eternal condition. If they are in heaven it will not make them more happy, and if they are not in heaven, it will never place them there.

In the third place, while that unmeasured eulogy which never rests till it has glorified its favourites, can do no possible good to the *dead*, it is calculated to do much harm to the *living*: and it is on this account, chiefly, that we enter our solemn protest against it. So long as it is tolerated and applauded by listening thousands, our young men who are hereafter to sustain the most important offices in the gift of a free people, will be apt to overlook, if they do not despise, those moral qualifications which alone are of any avail in the sight of God; and to expect a double immortality, as the reward of their political integrity and public services. If their predecessors have on these grounds been accepted and taken up to their high and eternal reward, why should *they* not confidently look for the same heavenly distinction, without giving themselves the trouble of passing through the valley of humiliation? Thus many will reason, and thus will they fatally mistake the way to future happiness, so long as the learned, the honourable, and the eloquent, conspire to perpetuate the fond and sweet delusion.

But while, in a Christian land, it has become so fashionable for orators and journalists to send their favourites to heaven, especially from the high places of society, on the same grounds, exactly, as the Romans were wont to place their heroes and conscript fathers in the Elysian fields, or to exalt them still higher; and while there is too much reason to fear, that most of the dis-

tinguished subjects of eulogy and statuary, are no better prepared for the presence and service of a holy God in the one case than they were in the other, it is delightful to think, how many bright exceptions the history of our own country furnishes to this remark. Some of our greatest and wisest and most useful men, have been among the best, among the humblest and most devoted servants of God. And though we cannot prove that the soul of one man is more valuable than that of another, we dwell with peculiar interest upon the evidence which a great public benefactor leaves behind him, that having 'served God and his generation, he has entered into the eternal joys of a good and faithful servant in the heavens.'

Such, in the judgment of their present eulogists, is the happy condition of the two venerable "Patriarchs of the Revolution," who left the world together, on the great day of their country's Jubilee. This favourable and even confident opinion of their having gone into the heavens, together with the grounds of it, so far as the writers before us have stated the reasons of their belief, we shall now submit to our readers in one connected view. "Scarcely had the funeral knell of Jefferson been sounded in our ears, when we were startled by the death of another patriot—of Adams the compeer of his early fame—the opposing orb of his meridian day—the friend of his old age and his *companion to the realms of bliss*." *Tyler*. p. 57. "And when the sun of that happy day was past his meridian, the acclamations of rejoicing, aroused them for a moment from the lethargy of approaching dissolution, to hail once more the great and glorious occasion; and their enfranchised souls instantly winged their flight to *the realms of bliss*." *Cushing*. p. 23. "You are gone! you have fought the good fight and have winged your flight from the



field of your fame, *to the regions of eternal bliss*, to receive your reward in heaven." *Cambreng*. p. 72. "Their *pure spirits* have been permitted to take their exit, on the brightest day the sun has ever lighted, and be wafted back to the great fountain of life." *S. Smith*. p. 91. "Whenever the fourth of July arrives, mankind will see in his rising beams the rays of liberty; and in his meridian path, the names of the two patriots, who consecrated the day to freedom, and *ascended to its rewards* on its Jubilee." *J. E. Sprague*. p. 259. "The blessings of emancipated millions have followed their spirits to those regions, *where life is without end and where sorrow never enters*." *Thornton*. p. 330. "Hope celestial, resignation and prayers for their country accompanied *their tranquil passage to immortality*." *Wilkins*. p. 347. Of the whole 'brave and animated band who signed the declaration of independence, with the exception of a single survivor, it is said, "They have bequeathed to us the immortal record of their virtue and patriotism, and *have ascended to a brighter reward than men can confer*." *Wirt*. p. 406. And again, "The wonder is, that two such men should on this fiftieth anniversary of the day on which they had ushered the cause of liberty into light, be caught up to heaven together in the midst of their raptures. May we not, with reverence, interpret the voice of heaven in this wonderful dispensation, 'These are my beloved servants in whom I am well pleased. They have finished the work for which I sent them into the world, and are now called to their reward.'"

Our readers will perceive, that the above extracts are taken from every part of this volume, and that they express not a strong *belief*, merely, but *full assurance*; and that not of *one*, but of many, that Adams and Jefferson are now in

'the realms of eternal bliss.' Other passages equally unequivocal might be quoted from the present "Selection," and indeed, the whole spirit of it is in accordance with the sentiment which these extracts so confidently express. Any strictures that we think it our duty to offer, would be quite premature, till the grounds of this high and celestial award are fully and fairly stated from the eulogists themselves; but we shall take this opportunity to make a few general remarks upon that more sacred species of eulogy, which we so often see in obituary notices, and so often hear on funeral occasions.

Such expressions as the following will be recognized by our serious readers as extremely common. "Our departed friend was a Christian"—"he evidenced his faith by his works"—"love to God and man were predominant traits in his character"—"he bore a long and distressing sickness with singular Christian fortitude and resignation"—"in all his sufferings he never uttered a murmuring word"—"he died as he had lived, a sincere Christian"—"he departed in the full hope of a glorious immortality"—"he has, as we confidently believe, entered into the joy of his Lord"—"his toils have ceased, his warfare is ended, and he has gone to his eternal rest."—"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."

Such things as these are every day said, not only of those who have been eminently distinguished for their piety, but of many, who while living, exhibited no remarkable proofs of love to God and the Saviour; and of some, who were never known to give any other evidence of piety than a cold profession of religion, and perhaps not even that, till it appeared in the newspapers. Far from us be the wish to prevent any bright Christian example from being held up to public view, or to condemn indis-

criminating the practice of expressing hope and even confidence in regard to the eternal state of the pious dead. There are some examples of "holy living" and "holy dying" which seem to leave no room for doubt that all is well after death; and to justify the highest degree of confidence which partiality itself can wish to express. But they are few in number, compared with the multitudes who go down to the grave; and even where the evidences of piety shine out in their holiest lustre, might it not in most cases be better to follow the example of Paul, and say, "a faithful brother, *as I suppose*," than to speak without any such qualification? The sacred writers are very sparing of their eulogiums upon departed saints, and indeed rarely say more of them than that they were gathered to their fathers. How much less do the scriptures authorize such hopes and assurance as we often hear expressed respecting the dead, who, so far as man can judge, neither lived the life nor died the death of the righteous.

It is certainly a very interesting inquiry, how far ministers of the gospel have countenanced, and are still in the habit of countenancing this unauthorized liberality of speech by their own example. That many go to the utmost verge of what is lawful, in their holy vocation, will not we presume be denied; but then it must be remembered that the circumstances in which they are placed are often peculiarly delicate and trying.

The death of a respectable parishioner, is always deeply afflictive to his family and friends; and they naturally look to their pastor for the strongest sympathy in their sorrows. In the mournful discharge of his official duties, he is expected to forget every blemish and doubtful trait in the character of the deceased, and with pious solicitude to recall every word and act and circumstance

which will bear a favourable construction. At the same time there seems to be a kind of tacit agreement throughout the parish, or town, to remember only the virtues of the dead; and even his enemies, if he had any, are more than half reconciled to his being sent to heaven, especially as they anticipate that they may one day need the same kind office themselves.

Thus while the grave and the fountains of grief and sympathy are all open at once, the minister is sent for to comfort the mourners and attend the funeral. He repairs to the house of weeping, and sits down with the widow and her fatherless children. Thus circumstanced, and earnestly wishing to console them to the full extent of his ability, how difficult is it to refrain from expressing a cheering hope that it is well with the husband and father, though he may have left no evidence of piety behind him. So when the pastor rises to speak in prayer, or in exhortation, it is commonly under an equal, if not an increased excitement. Nor is this all. Full well does he know, that every word from which his own views of the religious character of the deceased can be gathered, will be eagerly caught up and weighed by the audience. If he says nothing on the subject, friends will be dissatisfied and put the most unfavourable construction upon his silence. If on the other hand, to save their feelings, he expresses a hope in general and guarded terms, it is still worse. And to increase the embarrassment, it will sometimes happen, that the deceased has been a firm and liberal supporter of his minister; that he has left many wealthy and influential relations and friends in the parish; and that to increase their displeasure, would be extremely hazardous. A conscientious pastor will not, indeed, knowingly, suffer himself to be swayed by such motives; but

when he is often constrained thus to write and speak under the combined influence of sympathy, friendship, gratitude, and dependence, it would be strange if he were never to express more than he intends, or more, at any rate, than he ought to express. How many other causes may lend their influence to brighten the eternal prospects of men, as soon as they are dead, and to obtain the public testimony of serious ministers in favour of their piety, we shall not pretend to decide. The foregoing we believe are among the most active and powerful.

But to return from this digression. We anticipate the agreeable surprise with which some of our readers will learn for the first time from our extracts, that Adams and Jefferson must have been as much distinguished for piety, as for talents and public usefulness; and in turning over the pages of this volume for confirmation, they will look for nothing less than that species of evidence which they have been taught by their Bibles, and their old fashioned religious teachers to regard as essential. They will expect, for instance, the frequent recurrence of such words as *faith*, *hope*, *penitence*, *humility*, and in the honest simplicity of their minds, will doubtless wish to have more of the Christian experience of the two illustrious individuals, who according to their present eulogists, were so eminently ripe for heaven when they were "caught up" amid the shouts of the jubilee.

But unless other readers are more fortunate than we have been, they will find nothing of this kind to reward their search—nothing about communion with God, deadness to the world, taking up the cross, love to Christ, reliance upon his righteousness and atonement, delight in the scriptures, the sabbath, and the holy ordinances of the gospel. If Adams and Jefferson actually en-

joyed and exhibited these and similar evidences of meetness for the kingdom of heaven, we cannot but say that the authors of the present selection have done them great injustice; for they have studiously kept all such evidence out of sight.

It must not be supposed, however that these writers have omitted the proofs which *they* considered as entirely satisfactory, and they have left us to collect them at our leisure. Though we have availed ourselves diligently of the privilege, we are not positive that we have been completely successful. We believe however, that the book contains but two sources of evidence. First, the dying words of the "Sages," and secondly, their patriotic public services. Perhaps too much stress is apt to be laid upon the last words of the dying in every condition of life; and certain it is, that the scriptures make very little account of the manner in which men die, compared with the importance which they attach to "holy living." Still, it must always be interesting to know, how men's thoughts are employed in the immediate prospect of dissolution; and when the soul seems to triumph in anticipation of her deliverance from the body of this death, who can help regarding these dying exercises, as strong proofs, if not the very best that could be given, of preparedness for heaven?

What the all important subjects were, which engrossed the dying thoughts of Adams and Jefferson, and what evidence there is of fervent piety in their last words, will appear from the following extracts. Of Adams it is said, by one of his eulogists, "On the fourth (i. e. of July,) his faculties appeared to sink to eternal rest—nature was about to surrender her office to her God—the cannon of our Jubilee waked the dying patriot to momentary life—he inquired and was told the cause—in the accents of death he



articulated 'It is a great and glorious day.'" p. 60. By another, "The last words of the venerable Adams were, 'Independence forever!'" p. 88. "The illustrious Jefferson gave to the world his last declaration, 'I have done for my country and for all mankind *all that I could*, and I now resign my soul *without fear to my God*, my daughter to my country.'" p. 66. "Death is a debt incurred by all at our birth, and he has lived to little purpose, who when loaded with years and honours, and carrying with him the blessings of posterity and a grateful country, cannot say with our departed friend, (Mr. Jefferson,) '*I have done my duty on earth, I fear not to meet my Maker.*'" p. 326. "Those who surrounded the death-bed of Mr. Jefferson report, that in the few short intervals of delirium that occurred, his mind manifestly relapsed to the age of the Revolution. One of his exclamations was, 'Warn the Committee to be on their guard.' But these intervals were few and short. Reason was almost constantly upon her throne, and the *only* aspiration he was heard to breathe was the prayer, that he might live to see the fourth of July. When that day came, all that he was heard to whisper was, the repeated ejaculation, *Nunc Domine dimittas.*" p. 424.

We feel ourselves much obliged to the present eulogists for the report, (a faithful one no doubt,) which they have brought to us from the death-beds of Quincy and Monticello; but we are not quite certain that we understand the object of thus recording what fell from the dying lips of the two great men who left the world together on the fiftieth anniversary of American Independence. Was it to prove that they were ripe for heaven, or that their "ruling passion," love of liberty, "was strong in death?" If the latter, the point seems to be established beyond any reasonable

doubt. They died as they had lived, with their hearts set upon the independence and glory of their country; and far be it from us to say that they were unprepared for their last change. We do not know; and it is a question which we do not feel ourselves called upon to discuss. Our business is neither to affirm nor deny, but simply to examine all the evidence in the case which the present volume contains. Possibly other and better proofs might have been adduced, but we can judge only of such as are before us. If there is any thing decisive in the foregoing extracts it must be this. "*I have done for my country and for all mankind all that I could, and I now resign my soul without fear to my God.*" "*I have done my duty on earth, I fear not to meet my Maker.*" Stronger confidence than this, it must be admitted, a dying man could hardly express. But what does it prove? On what foundation does it rest?—the law or the gospel? "By grace," saith an apostle, "are ye saved through faith; and that *not of yourselves, it is the gift of God.*" "*Not of works, lest any man should boast.*" And again: "*Not by works of righteousness* which we have done, but according to *his mercy he saved us* through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

We confess it would have been much more satisfactory to us to have been informed, that notwithstanding all the eminent public services of Adams and Jefferson, they at the close of life explicitly renounced all dependence upon their own doings and merits, and expressed a humble, even though it had been a *trembling* hope of acceptance, through the atonement and righteousness of Christ. Some whose lives have testified most strongly in favour of their unfeigned and ardent piety have in view of the infinite holiness of God, and

their own sinfulness and omissions of duty, "loathed and abhorred themselves" in the hour of death; and not one of this class, we believe, was ever heard to say when going into the immediate presence of his Judge, "I have done my duty on earth, I fear not to meet him."

If, from the last words of the two venerated patriots of Quincy and Monticello, as recorded in the present volume, we turn to these nineteen eulogists and ask them what the other strong proofs are, on which they rest the oft repeated assurance, that the departed objects of their splendid panegyric have gone to the "realms of bliss," we are told of their great talents, ardent patriotism, and eminent public services. And the specifications are such as these. Adams, while yet a youth, uttered a kind of prophecy, which has since been remarkably fulfilled in the emancipation of our country from a foreign yoke, and in its unexampled prosperity under a free government. Jefferson, if not quite so far and clear sighted at first, was not a whit behind his illustrious compeer, in his early hatred of tyranny and attachment to republican principles. Each was known and honoured in his native state, ere the heavings of the revolution were felt, and each contributed, not a little, to hasten the crisis. Jefferson penned the Declaration of Independence, and Adams was its most powerful advocate. Both of them were employed on very important foreign embassies, and both contributed much by their talents and unbending integrity, to raise the character of our country abroad. Both were subsequently raised to the highest honours, which a free and enlightened people had it in their power to bestow: both lived to a great age in dignified retirement, rejoicing to the last hour in the liberties and happiness of this mighty republic, and both left

it together amid ten thousand sounds of jubilant festivity.

These and such as these are the only proofs, which after the most diligent and anxious search, we have been able to find in the volume before us, to sustain the positiveness with which it speaks, in so many places, of the glorious translation of Adams and Jefferson from earth to heaven. If other and scriptural evidence of their piety exists, why was it withheld? Will it be said, that such evidence would have been out of place in these popular funeral orations? Then we answer, it is equally out of place, to use the strong language of assurance in them. The latter must be regarded as entirely gratuitous, in the absence of the former. But as great talents, and love of country, and eminent political services, are thought, by many, to be exceedingly meritorious, or to deserve eternal rewards in the "realms of bliss," we cannot dismiss the present topic without a few additional remarks.

What merit, is there, we ask, in being endowed with distinguished natural abilities? And why is not the man who possesses but two talents, if he improves them faithfully, as deserving of commendation and reward as his neighbour who has five, or ten? We have learned from very ancient and high authority, that each will be 'judged according to what he hath, and not according to what he hath not.' It would be just as rational, and quite as scriptural to reckon a man's stature, or the colour of his eyes, or the height of his forehead, among his qualifications for heaven, as to lay any stress upon mere native talent, however brilliant, or extraordinary. And after all, how much more patriotic were Adams and Jefferson than they *ought* to have been? Could they have been less so, without abusing the confidence reposed

in them by their country? And how much more did they do for her welfare, than it was their duty to do? Which of all their illustrious deeds was supererogatory? Was it drawing up the memorable Declaration of Independence? Was it the thrilling eloquence which carried it through all its readings in the great Council of an injured and indignant people? Situated as they were, could Adams and Jefferson have done less without a positive dereliction of duty? And if not, strong as their claim will ever be upon the gratitude of their country, how could they *claim* any thing on this score from the hand of their Creator? While therefore we repeat, that we have nothing to affirm, or deny, in regard to the condition of Adams and Jefferson now that they are dwellers in eternity, we say without hesitation, that had their labours for the public weal been a thousand times greater than they were, these could never have laid the foundation of their acceptance with God. If they are saved, it is as the publican was eighteen hundred years ago; and relying *wholly* on the merits of Christ, they must have felt as he did, that they were miserable sinners.

There is one topic more of considerable importance, which we had reserved for a prominent place in this article; but which our restricted limits, will now compel us to dispose of, in two or three short paragraphs. We allude to the recognitions of a particular providence, which abound in the present "selection," and which we have not often had the pleasure to meet with in similar productions. They are such as the following. "Does there not seem to have been an especial providence in his death!" (that of Mr. J.) p. 7. "Surely the finger of Providence is visibly stretched forth in this long series of singular and unparallelled combinations of destiny." p. 51.

"May we not believe, that an all-seeing Providence as a mark of approbation of their well spent lives, has been mercifully pleased to grant their last prayer—" That they might be spared till the fourth of July." p. 22. "Let no cold calculating philosophy attempt to ascribe such an unheard of coincidence to natural causes." *Query*: must it not have been miraculous? "Let not the tongue of infidelity tax us with superstition when we consider this event as a *special* dispensation." p. 96. "In this splendid coincidence of words, what candid and enlightened mind, what grateful and ingenuous heart, hesitates to acknowledge one omniscient and benignant Providence?" p. 187. "Could they have chosen the day of their death, it would have been the one *decreed* by Providence." p. 257. It seems then, that the doctrine of Divine decrees is not held *exclusively* by ignorant fanatics! "Thus, fellow citizens, have our illustrious countrymen been *miraculously* gathered to their fathers." p. 60. Such is the general strain in which these writers speak of the providence of God in the removal of Adams and Jefferson. Whatever may be their views of the general doctrine of a superintending providence, extending to the minutest circumstances and events of every man's life, in one thing they seem to be perfectly agreed. Here was the *dignus vindice nodus*, and accordingly God interposed.

And so far as we can gather from the selection before us, their belief in a particular providence, rests in this case upon two grounds. First, that Adams and Jefferson were very great men, and therefore worthy of such a distinction: but secondly and chiefly, that they both died on the same day, and *that* day the fourth of July, and most of all, the great day of our political Jubilee. But we have yet to learn that either reason or scripture



makes any distinction in these respects, between the high and the low, the king and the beggar; or between the greatest and the smallest events; the fall of an empire and that of a "sparrow."

The absurdity of recognising the providence of God in great events, and on remarkable occasions only, might easily be pointed out, did time and space permit. Suffice it to say, that every great event is the result of numberless trains of antecedents and consequents, or is made up, so to speak, of innumerable small events, where their combined influence is brought to bear at once upon some important point. Now to say, that God ordered the American Revolution, for example, and yet had no particular agency in the countless millions of events and steps which led to it, is no less absurd than to affirm that he created the world in the aggregate, but did not create the elements and atoms of which it is composed. And what sound philosophy teaches, the Bible abundantly confirms. According to scripture, God is everywhere, and his efficiency, guided by his infinite wisdom, is always in operation. "In him we live and move and have our being." "Even the hairs of our head are all numbered." His providence was just as much concerned in keeping alive till that time the most obscure individual, who died on the fourth of last July, and then taking him away, as it was in the preservation, and removal of Adams and Jefferson. But here a wide and interesting field opens before us, which we cannot at present enter, though we shall hope to avail ourselves of some future opportunity to return and explore it. In the mean time, let all our readers reflect upon the emptiness of human glory; and posthumous eulogy, and seek for that honour which cometh from God only.

*The Death of Christ; being the substance of several Sermons delivered in Park Street Church, Boston, in the month of January, 1826. By S. EDWARDS DWIGHT, Boston. Crocker & Brewster, No. 50 Cornhill. 1826.*

THE subject of the Atonement made by Christ has recently awakened a deep sensation of interest among all classes of Christians in our country. Those who embrace the doctrine, that a proper atonement or expiation was made by the death of Jesus, have been roused up to a defence of this sentiment, by the bold and animated opposition which has been made against it: while those who have been engaged in making this opposition, seem not disposed to yield in the contest, nor to abate the force of the assaults which they make upon their opponents.

It is indeed a matter of deep interest, whether the doctrine in question be admitted or rejected; one of much deeper interest than its opponents seem willing to acknowledge. If there is any one truth, which is *fundamental* in the Christian system of doctrine, if there is any one thing, which constitutes a ground why Christianity should be regarded as a religion peculiar and distinct from all others; it is the atonement made for the sins of the world by the death of Christ. Leaving every form and species of polytheism out of the account, (because the difference between worshipping a plurality of gods and one God is so palpable and striking that all men at once discern it,) we may say with truth, that Christianity in many of the doctrines which it teaches, and of the duties which it prescribes, does not differ in any important respect from several other systems of religion. Modern Judaism, Mohammedism, and Theism, agree in

maintaining that there is one only living and true God, who is self-existent, eternal, immutable, omniscient, omnipotent, and possessed of boundless wisdom, purity, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth. They agree, that he is the proper object of religious worship, prayer, praise, gratitude, submission, obedience, love, and confidence. They agree in inculcating most of the moral and social virtues ; in urging upon men the law of mutual kindness and benevolence ; the obligation to parental, filial, conjugal, and social affection. They agree in teaching that the soul of man is immortal ; that there is a judgment to come ; that God will reward the good and the evil, according to their works in the present world ; and that the only method of escape from misery, greater or less, in the life to come, is by a life of piety and virtue here, (i. e.) religious regard toward God, and justice and kindness toward men.

That there are Jews, Mohammedans, and Theists, so called, who do not *practice* the principles which have just been presented to view, is readily conceded. Is it not equally true, that a multitude of Christians, so called, are utter strangers to the power of the truths which they profess to believe ? Still, no sober man can regard this as evidence that Christianity itself does not inculcate the truths which they neglect. Just so in the case of Jews, Mohammedans, and Theists, with respect to doctrines which they *practically* neglect. These doctrines do not the less belong to their respective systems of religion. To the system of modern Judaism, as exhibited in the best writings of the Rabbies, to the Koran in its simple state, unchanged by the glosses of late Mohammedan expositors, and to Theism as exhibited by Lord Herbert, and by Wegscheider, now professor of Theology at Halle, in Prussia, the appeal

may be made with confidence, for justification in respect to the statement which has just been made. None who are acquainted with these documents, will undertake to deny its correctness.

In fact, all of these various systems are indebted to Christianity for most that is excellent in them. Modern Judaism, although bitter against the religion of Jesus, has, after all, notoriously borrowed many of its maxims of morality and piety from the writers of the New Testament. The Rabbies did, indeed, find most of the important principles of this nature in the Old Testament ; but in addition to what they found there, they have secretly transferred to their books many things from the precepts of Jesus, and intermixed them with the doctrines which they teach.

Mohammed confessedly did this. He professed to regard Jesus as a true prophet, and a divinely commissioned teacher. The Koran is an evident compound of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, and of Arabian philosophy and religion, joined with a multitude of conceits that originated from the enthusiastic and deluded mind of Mohammed himself, that most distinguished and singular of all impostors.

Modern Theism, beyond all doubt, owes its best and purest doctrines, both in relation to piety and morality, to the Christian system. The men who erected this edifice came from the bosom of the Christian church. Indeed many of them profess to resort to the New Testament, as one of the sources of evidence, from which the principles of the religion of nature may be deduced.

What wonder, then, that modern Judaism, Mohammedism, and Theism, should accord with Christianity, in so many of their precepts and principles both of religion and morality ? In a greater or less degree, the authors of all these systems

consulted the New Testament, and selected from it such things, as they judged would comport with the particular views and designs which they themselves entertained.

But however many may be the points, in which all these systems substantially coincide, so far as *theory* is concerned, with the Christian religion, yet there are other points in which they all *fundamentally* differ from it. Among the most prominent and important of all, is the great doctrine of the *Atonement*. Here the devotees of all these systems turn sceptics at once. The offence of the cross is to them a grievous offence. They reject the idea of propitiating a holy God by the death of Jesus, with scorn and contumely. They tread under foot the blood of the cross, and regard it as an unholy thing. They scoff at those who admit the doctrine of reconciliation to God by the mediator's death; and regard them as men bereaved of their reason, or as under the influence of a pitiable enthusiasm.

It is clear, then, that the doctrine in question is one of those *fundamental truths*, which are the distinctive sign or badge of the Christian religion, as a religion different from the others which have been named. It is one principal thing, which makes our holy religion to be appropriately *Christianity*, and not Judaism, not Mohammedism, not Theism. No wonder, then, that those who view the subject in such a light, and who have deliberately avowed themselves to be Christians, should contend with earnestness, nay with persevering and invincible earnestness, for a doctrine of such fundamental and distinctive importance.

The *distinctive* nature of it is, indeed, too plain to be seriously called in question. The *fundamental* importance of it, however, we know by unhappy experience has often, very often, been called in question,

and is still denied. Yet even those who deny it, must admit, that if we who believe it are correct in our views with regard to its being a Scriptural doctrine, its *importance* cannot reasonably be questioned. Whether salvation is vouchsafed to men, only through the medium of the atoning blood of Jesus; or whether this produces a *direct* and *immediate* influence at all upon our reconciliation to God; are questions of everlasting moment to every sinner in this world of probation. Those who believe in the reality and necessity of the atonement, in the expiatory sacrifice of Christ, may well insist on the liberty of being in earnest, upon a question of such a nature. The belief or rejection of this truth, does, in their view, stand *essentially* connected with the belief or rejection of a Saviour; and of course with everlasting happiness or misery. Shall they not be in earnest then, to defend this doctrine when they believe it; and in earnest, to inculcate it upon others?

We do not offer these remarks, because we think that an apology is necessary, for the deep interest which we feel about the subject in question, in common with most of the churches in our land. They are offered merely to show those who may be inclined to wonder why we should make so much of this topic, that if there be any subject in the Christian religion, of which much is to be made, this is to be regarded as one of them. They are intended, also, to impress still more deeply on those who believe in the great doctrine of the atonement, and contend for it, that they have much reason to contend for it, and to hold it fast as the distinguishing and fundamental doctrine of the religion which they profess.

We count ourselves to be among those, who regard with great satisfaction, the deep sensibility of the



religious public, towards the doctrine in question. It augurs well if it be well regulated. It shows that Christians are not inclined in these philosophizing days, to be turned about by every wind of doctrine. "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and forever," said the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, after labouring through a long and masterly argument, to illustrate and enforce the doctrine of atonement by the blood of Jesus. So would we say, at the present time. While the relation of God to man, as lawgiver, sovereign, and judge exists; and of man to God, as his subject, and accountable to him for all his actions, and thoughts, and affections; the doctrine of the atonement must be of *fundamental* importance. Man, born as he now is, with predominating carnal appetites, will ever be a sinner, and "without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sin." Yet "it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin." The Lamb of God" only can "take away the sins of the world." If Jesus then, be not "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever," as one expiatory, atoning sacrifice, then will ruin, endless and remediless, befall our guilty race, who have sinned, and for whom no atoning sacrifice has been made. Surely "there remaineth no other sacrifice for sin;" and only "judgment and fiery indignation must be expected by adversaries!"

We rejoice therefore, in the very deep sympathy which pervades the churches, on this great subject. Not because we are sticklers for all the old *terminology* and *modes of explanation*, which the schools of former days, or their adherents in later times, have employed. We do not place any value upon *terms*, farther than they are significant of *things*; yea, and of *intelligible things*. What one mind has conceived, can be communicated to

another. God who made man a rational and social being, and gave him the powers of language, endowed him with the faculty of communicating rational and intelligent thoughts to others; specially those which do not depend on the mere subjective state of individual feeling and views, but are the result of reflection and reasoning. *Terms*, then, which the schoolmen have employed, in reference to the doctrine of the atonement, if they are significant of *things*, and things taught in Scripture, may well be retained. There is no merit in that love of novelty and passion for change, that would discard any thing because the schoolmen said, or believed, or taught it. Nor, on the other hand, do we fear to reject or oppose any terminology, which they or their adherents have employed, provided, on examination, it be found to be either unmeaning, or erroneous, or superfluous, or antisciptural.

We suppose ourselves to agree substantially, in regard to the doctrine of the atonement, with the great body of the Protestant divines, who have treated of this subject, since the commencement of the Reformation. We believe in the *vicarious* sufferings of Christ for sinners. We do not believe in his death merely as a martyr to the cause of truth, and that it merely serves the cause of moral suasion, and thus contributes to our salvation. Nor do we believe, that the example of constancy, fortitude and obedience, which he exhibited by his death, is all that makes him a Saviour on account of his sufferings. We believe fully, that there is other influence, besides that of moral suasion in any form, exerted by his death upon our salvation. We do not deny the influence of moral suasion from his example, in exciting men to virtue, and in directing and animating their efforts. We believe in it *fully*. And so we do,

in the influence of the examples of all the apostles and martyrs, for the like end. But we believe, that Christ's sufferings were a *substitute* for those which sinners deserved; that they were *vicarious*, that is, that they were in the room and stead of those sufferings which sinners deserved; God accepted them in lieu of the punishment which believers must have suffered, unless they had obtained forgiveness; and that the death of Christ does, in this way, have a *direct* bearing upon the pardon and acceptance of a penitent sinner with God, and not merely exercise a moral influence in persuading him to forsake sin, and repent, and thus obtain pardon. This last we admit, to a certain extent; but it is very far from being *all* which we admit and believe. We admit, with the great mass of all the reformed churches, the doctrine of a *true and real expiation* made by the death of Jesus; and believe with the prophet, that the Lord "laid upon him the iniquity of us all," that is, we believe that the sufferings endured by Christ were accepted by our Lawgiver and eternal Judge, in lieu of the punishment due to our sins. Such, we have no doubt, is the meaning of the prophet himself, in the sentence just quoted. The word rendered *iniquity*, (*וְעֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ*) means also *consequences of sin*, viz. affliction, suffering, as well as the *cause of sin*, viz. crime or moral turpitude.

We are thus explicit, in our declarations, because we know the sensibility of the religious public to be such, on this subject, that when we profess, (as we do not scruple to profess,) that we reject some terminology and modes of explanation which have been often adopted and insisted on, with relation to the doctrine of the atonement, we incur the danger of being charged with rejecting the doctrine, that the sufferings of Christ are to be regarded as *vicarious*, or that his suffer-

ings and death were a *substitute* for the punishment which the sinner deserved. Nothing can be farther from our design than to deny this; for this we believe to be the *distinctive* and *essential* trait of the great doctrine in question. But we do not maintain, nor do we believe, that the sufferings of Christ were the same in *kind*, as the sinner deserved; nor the same in *quantity*, as he deserved. Not the first, because Christ had not a guilty conscience, that "worm which never dies" in the sinner's breast; he knew his sufferings were to be brief, and that he should come out from them, and of course he was not in despair, like the sinner in the world of woe. Not the second, because he suffered but a short period, even if you include his whole life within the pale of suffering; he suffered as *man*, and not as the immutable and impassible God; and he could not, therefore, undergo sufferings, within this period, equal in quantity to the sufferings which all the redeemed must have endured, had they been forever cast off. A *substitution* does not involve the notion of an exact *quid pro quo*, an equivalency in *all* respects both as to kind and quantity. Nay the very term itself scarcely ever implies this. We speak of an *exact equivalent*, rather than of a *substitution*, when a *quid pro quo* in *all* respects is had, in case of an exchange. We do not believe in the necessity of a *strict*, literal *quid pro quo*, in such a *moral* transaction as that of the atonement. Enough, that the law is honoured; that God is satisfied it is so; and that he is now willing to accept penitent sinners, as though they had obeyed. Enough, that the awful consequences of sin are held up, in the most striking and impressive manner, by the death of Christ. Enough, that better purposes have been answered by this death, than would have been accomplished by carrying the law into *literal* execu-

tion. This is *satisfaction*, (to use the language of the old school,) in its highest and best possible sense. We need no weighing in scales, adjusted even by particles of dust, the *exact quantity* of suffering which Christ must undergo, in order to make out a literal *quid pro quo* for the justice and penalty of the law. We believe in no *personal* and *literal* transfer of guilt, of moral turpitude, on the one hand; or of holiness on the other. All these things, we believe to be the result of excessive and tenuous speculations on the doctrine in question; the result of *a priori*, and not of *scriptural* reasoning.

But then we trust that most of those who have indulged in such excessive speculations, did, after all, hold fast to what is *essential* in regard to the atonement. While, therefore, we decline to speculate with them in these *minima*, we do not exclude them from our fellowship, nor from our Christian confidence and affection.

Whenever we read or hear sentiments, in respect to the atonement, which involve the idea that the sufferings of Christ must have *exactly equalled* the penalty of the law, had it been executed upon believers, we always feel compelled instinctively to ask, Then what gain has accrued to the universe, by his death? The quantity of suffering, on the whole, is not diminished; and where then is *mercy*, the very idea of which is, relaxing the demands of strict justice? *Moral equivalency* or *satisfaction* is what we expect, and what we think we find in the scriptural representation of the atonement. But even here, the sacred writers indulge in no refined and minute speculation. There is scarcely any one passage, which, construed agreeably to the laws of sound interpretation, conveys directly an idea of this nature. It follows rather from the collation of many passages, and in the way

of deduction from their import. So little did those who were inspired to speak on the all-important subject of the atonement, indulge in the distinctions and minuteness of systematic theology.

We have said enough to shew, that we are neither opposed to any views because they are old, in regard to the topic under consideration; nor attached to any because they are new. We would fain follow the simple *biblical* view of it, free from all additions made by human refinements, and equally free from all interpretation forced upon the Scriptures by philosophy and reasonings *a priori*.

We repeat it, that we are sincerely rejoiced to see such a deep sensibility pervade the Christian public, in regard to the doctrine of the atonement. It is an omen of good to the cause of Christianity. But, on the other hand, it is not difficult to perceive, that it is fraught with some danger also. Even to discuss the subject of atonement, is, at present, putting to hazard a man's good name, if not his standing in the church. If he departs from the beaten path, the cry of *wanderer* is raised. If he refuses to use old names, and old forms of expression, he is in danger of being thought heretical. Scarcely can one venture even to discuss minor points relative to this subject, without finding some one to cry out against him. This is unfortunate with regard to discovering what is true, and discouraging to those who are inclined to pursue investigations of such a nature. —Still, there are minds, deeply enough engaged in this great cause, to venture upon the pursuit of what is scriptural, and upon the rejection of what philosophy has added to the scriptures. We rejoice that there are; and after all the various speculations, in one form and another, indulged in by not a few who have had extensive influence in the



religious world, there appears now to be a general leaning among the most able of our theologians, to hold fast to the simple scriptural form of the doctrine in question, regarding the whole as a matter of pure revelation, and not to be judged of by the maxims of natural religion.

The author of the discourses, which are named at the head of this article, would be entitled to some apology for our long delay to review his work, on the interesting subject in question, if it were proper and expedient for us to make apologies of this nature. Circumstances beyond our controul, have been the only occasion of our delay.

Mr. Dwight is one of those investigators, whom we have just named with approbation. His great aim, through nearly the whole of that part of his treatise (if we may so call it) which is devoted to the investigation of the question, For what purpose did Christ die? is to give a *scriptural* view of the end and object of his death. The general plan, which he has pursued throughout his book, we will present in his own words.

"As this [viz. the object answered by the death of Christ] is a point of mere revelation, it can be determined only by a reference to the scriptures; and he, who examines them attentively for this purpose, will perceive that the sacred writers have adopted two different modes of presenting the subject to the mind. They have recorded a series of *facts* relative to the Death of Christ, which no believer in the scriptures can controvert. They have also, in various *forms of phraseology*, directly declared the great end for which he died. It will be admitted that these facts, and these forms of phraseology rightly interpreted, are perfectly consistent *with each other*; and that no explanation of this event, which is not consistent *with both*, can be true. In attempting to answer this question, it is my design therefore, to detail the facts connected with it at

some length; to recite also the forms of expression referred to, with the view of determining their true *scriptural* import; and then to enquire how far the various Theories devised to account for the Death of Christ are consistent with these facts, and with the plain declarations of the scriptures. It was the rule of NEWTON, in his philosophical researches, to reject every explanation of an event inconsistent with the *phenomena* that attended it; and, to adopt the same rule on the present occasion, will probably be regarded by every mind as at once fair and safe." p. 4.

The author next proceeds to state various interesting facts, which the scriptures disclose to our view, relative to his subject. We shall give a brief summary, with remarks as occasion may require.

1. *The death of Christ was not the result of accident.* The proofs adduced, are Acts ii. 23. iv. 27, 28.

2. *It was the subject of prophecy.* Various passages from the New Testament are cited under this head, which are conclusive in regard to the point in question. We do not, however, feel so well persuaded, as Mr. Dwight appears to be, that Gen. iii. 15, has particular reference to the death of Christ; although we believe with him, that the serpent which tempted Eve, was the "Old Serpent," the devil, who was a murderer from the beginning. The original Hebrew of this verse is difficult and obscure; and if our translation gives a correct view of its meaning, it still is in our apprehension, far from being certain that the death of Christ is specifically intended by it. We should be more inclined to believe, that the general contest between the Prince of Light and the prince of darkness is the object of the sentiment; and that the victory of the former over the latter is predicted, while intimation is at the same time given, that the latter will not be inactive, nor destitute of the power of inflicting some wounds.

3. *The death of Christ was absolutely necessary.* In a general respect, we accede to the proposition. There are different kinds of *necessity*, if we may so speak. God is necessarily holy, just, and good, because a self-existent and all-perfect being cannot be otherwise. In such a sense, we conceive the death of Christ cannot well be affirmed to be necessary. Indeed, we can well conceive of no other *necessity*, in the case before us, than that of *fitness, propriety*; that is, all things considered, more important ends were accomplished by the death of Christ, than would have been accomplished without it. So infinite wisdom has judged; and we are bound to presume, that it has so judged for good reasons. The death of Christ is a matter too serious in its nature, to have taken place without sufficient reason.

Indeed, Mr. Dwight himself has led the way to such a view of the subject, in the second paragraph under the present head, where he states, that the necessity did not originate either from the fact that the death of Christ was predicted, nor from any arbitrary appointment of God. We come then, after all, singly to the ground, that the *ends to be accomplished* by the death of Christ were the grounds of its necessity; ends which infinite wisdom decided could be best accomplished in this way. To this we entirely accede. But to say that the death of Christ was *absolutely necessary*, and to construe *δὲ* as meaning *it was necessary*, is somewhat more indefinite than this writer is usually wont to be. In fact *δὲ* often means such a kind of necessity as results from circumstances, or such an obligation as *duty* imposes upon any one. For example, Matt. xviii. 33. xxiii. 23. xxv. 27. Mark xiii. 14. Luke xiii. 14. Heb. ii. 1. We admit, that it is also employed in other cases, to designate that which is *unavoidable*,

in its highest sense. Our criticism has not respect to the *thing* at which Mr. Dwight is aiming, but to show, that the terms *absolutely necessary* do not express, in the most definite manner, exactly what he meant, if we rightly understand him.

4. *It has excited a very deep interest in the heavenly world.*

Here Mr. D. quotes 1 Pet. 1, 10—12, in order to show that the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow “had been *early* revealed in heaven, and had occupied the deeply interested attention of its exalted inhabitants.” The fact may indeed have been so; we have no authority to contradict it. But neither are we persuaded, that from this passage we have any to affirm it. Peter wrote his epistle more than a score of years *after* the sufferings and death of Christ. He speaks of the angels *then*, (at the time when he wrote,) as eagerly searching into the mysteries of a Saviour’s death; *εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι*, *into which things the angels ARE DESIROUS to look*. This cannot prove that they had been thus engaged before the coming of the Saviour, or before his sufferings and death.

The facts that an angel came from heaven, to comfort the suffering Saviour in the garden of Gethsemane, and that angels descended to roll away the stone from the mouth of his sepulchre, may prove that he who ruleth in heaven was interested in the person of Jesus, and sent ministering servants to perform offices of kindness to him. This cannot show to us, what was the state of the angel’s minds, who were *sent* on these errands, in respect to the death of Christ. Especially the fact, that an angel rolled away the stone from the mouth of Jesus’ sepulchre, and that two angels, in that sepulchre, announced to the disciples the resurrection of Jesus, would rather

prove their interest in his *resurrection* than in his death; if indeed it could prove either. In all these cases, however, as they were the simple ministers of God, sent to perform these offices, the subjective views which they may have had respecting the death of Christ, can only be a matter of indirect deduction from circumstances of such a nature.

In the quotations, which our author further makes, from Rev. v., the first part at least, applies only to those who had been "redeemed by a Saviour's blood;" which surely could not include the angels, and therefore does not apply to *all* the inhabitants of heaven. And if the sequel is of more extensive import, and embraces them *all*, (which however is very doubtful, as most probably *all* the redeemed are meant) yet the adoration of heaven goes rather to show the views which the heavenly world entertained of the *person* or *dignity* of the Lamb, than to prove the subjective feelings which they had respecting his sufferings and death.

Indeed Mr. D. himself tells us, in the next paragraph, that "hitherto the songs of heaven had been occupied in praising God for the display of his perfections in *creation* and *providence*; but that *now*, the upper world had learned a *new song*—an ascription of praise and blessing to the Lamb that was slain," p. 8. But if the death of Christ, had been *early* revealed in heaven, and had for ages been the theme of earnest contemplation there, how can it be, that it had never before called forth a song of praise from its blessed and benevolent inhabitants?

5. *A similar degree of importance is attached to this event, by the sacred writers.* The quotations to prove this are appropriate; and they might be indefinitely extended so as to comprise no small part of the New-Testament. But it was unnecessa-

ry; and brevity demanded of our author to abstain.

6. *Various titles are given to Christ, in reference to his death, which are given to no other person.* The examples produced are, Lamb of God, Redeemer, Saviour, Deliverer, Ransom. Saviour, Deliverer, and Redeemer too, he might have been called, had he been commissioned to accomplish only by some peculiar instructions, moral suasion and example, the liberation of men from the power and penalty of sin. God, who brought Israel out of Egypt, is often called their *Redeemer*. But the *Lamb of God* seems necessarily to imply his death; and *ransom*, under circumstances in which it is employed, may perhaps be classed with it.

7. *Many persons of real piety, who went to heaven, lived and died before the death of Christ.* This head, we presume is intended by the author as preparatory merely for the one which follows, and might have been united with it. As it now stands, it does not in any way, of itself, carry forward the design which the author has in view.

There is one idea, however, thrown out upon this head, which we shall briefly notice. It is this, viz. that the view of the saints in ancient times, respecting the death of Christ, were exceedingly imperfect, because "no prophecy of Scripture is of *its own interpretation*;" for so Mr. D. renders *ἰδίᾳ ἐπιλύσεως*. He adds, by way of explanation, that "it is not *adequately* understood, until it is fulfilled." If by *adequately*, our author means, that when events have come to pass which were anciently predicted, those who are witnesses of the actual events, will have a better and more complete view of them than those who lived before this happened, we accede without any hesitation. But if, as many have maintained, Mr. D. supposes that the ancient predictions were not



intelligible either to the prophets themselves who uttered them, or to the people to whom they were addressed; then we ask, What purpose did they subserve? *Prophecy* is either to instruct or to console men, to whom it is addressed. But prophecy *unintelligible* can surely do neither. And if the prophets who were inspired, did not understand their own words, how are succeeding generations, not inspired, to understand them? If you say, "By the fulfilment of them;" we ask, the fulfilment of what? By your own statement, it is the fulfilment of *something unintelligible*, by any of the rules of language. Where then do you come at a rule, to make out a meaning with which you compare any particular event that has happened? After all then, it seems you do put a gloss on the words, by some rule or other of interpretation; and then you say, there is fulfilment. Surely, now if you have made out a meaning for the prophet's words, in order to compare a certain event with it, the prophet might at least have been equally able to make out one for himself, since he was inspired, and uttered ideas which were in his own mind.

Look at the subject in another light. *Words* are the signs of *ideas*. The prophet's words are the signs of his ideas. They are signs then of ideas entertained by men, and communicated for men, and addressed to them. If you say, "No; they are the signs of the ideas of the Spirit, and not of the prophets;" we reply, in the language of Paul, "the spirit of the prophets is subject to the prophets." Inspiration destroys neither their free-agency, nor their rationality, nor does it change the native colouring of their style. In using words, then, while inspired, the prophets used them, as at other times; that is, they used them as signs of ideas which they *had*, not

as signs of ideas which they *had not*. In fact, the statement of prophecy is a *revelation* of future events, and yet that this *revelation* is intelligible, neither to him who makes it, nor to those to whom it is made, is not far from the regions of palpable contradiction. We entirely dissent from such a view of this subject.

We do not however, tax Mr. D. with such a view. But we cannot accede to his version of *ἰδίας ἐπιλώσεως*. The sequel shows, that the meaning is, *no prophecy is of*, that is, springs from, *a man's own power of explaining*, that is of *pointing out, disclosing* things future, for the writer goes on immediately to show that this power was communicated by the Holy Ghost, and not possessed by man as he was in himself considered.

8. *Pious persons before the death of Christ, felt a deep interest in that event.* The quotations under this head, seem to clash with the doctrine laid down in the preceding one. Here Mr. D. labours, (and with success,) to show that pious persons in ancient times had such views of the sufferings and death of Christ as to feel a deep interest in them. They did interpret prophecy, then, and it comforted and edified them, long *before* the events took place to which it refers.

9. *Christ knew that he was to suffer death.* This is briefly but sufficiently proved, by citations from the Scriptures.

10. *His death was not deserved.* In proving this, Mr. Dwight has shown that he had neither transgressed any of the precepts of the Levitical law, nor any of the rules of the Roman government. At the hand of God, he did not *deserve* death; for he was sinless, and perfect in his obedience. The whole is forcibly and appropriately illustrated and confirmed.

*To be continued.*

## LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL INTELLIGENCE.

The Rev. Joseph Torrey, of Royalton, has been elected to the Professorship of Languages and Belles Letters, in the University of Vermont. A system of reform in the instruction and discipline of the University has been made out, and is before the Trustees for consideration.

Richard Randall, M. D. has been appointed Professor of Chemistry, in the Medical Department of Columbian College, in place of Edward Cutbush, M. D. resigned.

Mr. Thomas Campbell, the poet, has been unanimously appointed Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow.

*The Rhode Island Historical Society* have put to press the following rare works, by Roger Williams, the foun-

der of Religious Freedom—"A Key into the Language of America, or an Help to the Language of the natives in that part of America called New-England. Together with brief observations of the Customs, Manners and Worship, &c. of the aforesaid Natives in Peace and War, in Life and Death. On all which are added Spiritual Observations."

*Boston Ath.*—The North American Review states that the number of volumes now at this institution, with those daily expected, is about 23,000; and the number of ancient and modern medals and coins 13,437, many of which are very rare and valuable. The present property of the Athenæum in books, buildings, &c. exceeds 100,000 dollars. The building cost over \$13,000.

## NEW PUBLICATIONS.

## RELIGIOUS.

The Gospel the Wisdom of God. A Sermon preached at Salem, Feb. 14, 1827, at the ordination of the Rev. John P. Cleaveland. By William B. Sprague.

The influence of Truth: A Sermon delivered in Newburyport, March 20, 1827; at the Dedication of the New Brick Church, in Titiomb street. By L. F. Dimmic. Newburyport: C. Whipple.

Inspiration of the Scriptures: A Sermon, delivered at the ordination of the Rev. Messrs. Scales and Crosby. By Rev. Justin Edwards, of Andover. Boston.

Means of Regeneration; A Discourse, by the Rev. Gardiner Spring, D. D. of New-York. John P. Haven. National Preacher, Vol. I. No. II. Sermon XV. By Leonard Woods, D. D.; on the Duties of the Rich.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

The object of the American Society for Meliorating the Condition of the Jews, explained, and Objections An-

swered: In a letter by the Rev. C. F. Frey. G. & C. Carvill, New-York.

Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery, as applied in Reading and Speaking. By Ebenezer Porter, D. D. Andover.

America; or a General Survey of the Political situation of the several powers of the Western Continent; with Conjectures on their Future Prospects. By A. H. Everett, Esq. pp. 364, 8vo. Cary & Lea, Philadelphia.

A Treatise on Diet: with a view to Establish on Practical Grounds, a system of Rules for the Prevention and Cure of the Diseases incident to a Disordered state of the Digestive Functions. By J. A. Paris, M. D. F. R. S. Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, &c. &c. Philadelphia. Robert H. Small. 1826. 8vo. pp. 210.

Poems by Mrs. Felicia Hemans. Boston. Hilliard. 1827. 2vols. 8vo.

The Book of Nature. By John Mason Good, M. D. F. R. S. &c. of Philadelphia. In two vols. 8vo. Boston. Wells & Lilly. 1826.

## MONTHLY RECORD.

## RELIGIOUS.

REVIVALS seem to be increasing in number and power throughout our country. They exist at the present time in more than two hundred towns in the New-England and Middle States; and in several places are attended with unusually great and blessed results. Among the Colleges which share in these blessings, are Yale, Williams, Princeton, Dickinson and Athens, Geo. The work of the Spirit in Yale has for several weeks been silent, but powerful.

*Ireland.*—The latest English Journals bring intelligence of the religious movements in Ireland which is exceedingly interesting. The schools are becoming well attended, and the Scriptures are beginning to be circulated, and read with interest, and the consequence is, as we might expect, a re-nunciation of popery.

This reformation is met with decided opposition. The priests are not satisfied with pouring torrents of scandal and persecuting lava from their altars, but with great vigilance go from house to house, and threaten with vengeance those who would send their children to the schools, read the Bible, or hear the gospel preached. There is a mighty struggle between light and darkness, and the opposition only renders His triumphs more glorious, who has all power in heaven and on earth. Great numbers have left, and are leaving the popish Babylon.

The single county of Cavan numbers 500 who have embraced the protestant religion since October last: and it is believed that similar changes would follow in equal numbers in other places, if the people were protected and employed. Many of those who have changed their religion, it is hoped, have also been 'turned from darkness to light, and from the power of satan unto God.'

*Beyroot.*—Mr. Goodell, Missionary of the American Board, writes, October 9, from Beyroot, that the prospects of that station had latterly become very encouraging. He particularizes seven individuals who had within the last ten months become the subjects of renewing grace. Some of

these were young men of much promise, and others persons of distinction, among whom were an armenian archbishop, and the lady of the British consul. The prejudices against female education were breaking away. In the several schools of the mission there were ninety girls, and nearly four hundred boys.

*Farewell Letter of Mr. King.*—Mr. King on returning from the Mediterranean, had addressed a Farewell Letter to the people of Syria. This letter which Mr. Goodell printed with Scripture notes, produced an unlooked for impression. At Constantinople, in which city and its vicinity are 100,000 Armenians, a general meeting of the monks, priests, and patriarchs, of that church was assembled, Mr. King's letter was discussed at length, and its references to the Bible consulted. A warm discussion arose respecting the practices of the Armenian church, and various resolutions were carried, setting forth its corruptions. One resolution declares that no young man shall enter the monastic orders for twenty-five years to come. Light is breaking in upon the East.

*Death of Mrs. Judson*—Mrs. Judson, wife of the Rev. Dr. Judson, Missionary in Burmah, died in October last, at Amherst settlement, lately commenced by the British.

*South Sea Islands.*—The following is an extract of a letter from a gentleman belonging to the United States, dated Otaheite, August 18, 1826.

"The missionaries have wrought wonders among these people; but their work is yet far from being complete; and I fear about this time, their labors will be interrupted by a civil war. The queen, in whom the regency of the island is vested, during the minority of young Pomare, the heir apparent to the throne, has recently married, contrary to the wishes of many of her subjects, particularly those who inhabit the south side of the island, (and they are the stronger party, and insist upon the queen's abdication, or a dissolution of the marriage.) But as her majesty does not think proper to comply with either of these demands, by which refusal she will be supported in



the district, and most of the enlightened men, a recourse to arms will be the probable result; and, if ever resorted to, it is not easy to say what will be the consequence. A general council of the chiefs and missionaries is to be held at the great council house, near this, in a few days, to discuss the merits of the royal matrimony, at which the question of peace or war will be determined. The missionaries have packed up their movable effects, and some have embarked their most valuable things, ready to decamp upon the first commencement of hostilities."

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

*The African Improvement Society of New-Haven*, for the improvement of the intellectual, moral, and religious condition of the African population of this city, held a meeting on the evening of the 20th April, which was attended by a large collection of citizens. The meeting was addressed in a very appropriate manner by the Rev. S. S. Jocelyn, Prof. Silliman, Rev. S. Merwin, Rev. S. E. Dwight, and Prof. Taylor.

*The American Colonization Society*, at a late meeting, passed a resolution to appoint a Committee, to prepare and to cause to be translated into the several languages of most current use in Europe and America, a memorial to the sovereign authority of every maritime nation on both continents, earnestly soliciting the denunciation of the Slave Trade as piracy. The Committee are Gen. Mercer, Gen. Jones, and the Rev. Dr. Lawrie.

*A Peace Society* has been organized at the Theological Seminary, at Andover, of which the Rev. Dr. Porter is President, and the Rev. Dr. Murdock,

Corresponding Secretary. From the enlarged spirit of philanthropy, which is cherished in that Institution, we are led to expect a happy influence from this Society.

*Lotteries.*—The post-master general has contributed his mite to check a growing evil in this country, by forbidding any deputy post-master keeping a lottery office, being concerned in selling tickets, or franking lottery schemes, tickets, or advertisements, on penalties for each and every infraction of this rule, contained in his last circular instructions. A great facility in the lottery operations is thus very properly cut off to a considerable number of dealers in the business.

The following from Niles' Register, respecting lotteries in Rhode Island, will show too nearly the prevalence of this evil in many parts of our country.

During the last year the sale of lottery tickets in Rhode Island exceeded the sum of one million, six hundred and sixty thousand, nine hundred dollars. Each individual then, on an average must have gambled to the amount of twenty dollars. Or each family to the amount of 120 dollars a year. The lotteries, as at present managed, are at about 40 to 45 per cent. against the purchasers of tickets—so that if the purchasers in Rhode Island received a fair share of all the prizes, the loss to them was say *six hundred and seventy-four thousand dollars!* This is *taxing and swindling* upon a large scale! What if the United States, on the greatest emergency, should require the annual payment of so large a sum, of the people of Rhode Island? But they are as others. The outrageous lottery system has reached the poorest and most miserable classes of society.

---

### ORDINATIONS AND INSTALLATIONS.

Feb. 7.—The Rev. JACOB FISK over the Baptist Church at Lodi, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Abbot, of Covert.

Feb. 21.—The Rev. CHARLES L. COOK, was ordained Pastor of the Baptist Church at Hanson, Mass.

Feb. 22.—The Rev. JOHN BARRET,

was ordained at Mesopotamia, Ohio, to the work of the Ministry. Sermon by the Rev. Luther Humphrey.

March 7.—The Rev. ORA PEARSON, over the Congregational Church at Kingston, N. H. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Ingraham, of Bradford, Mass.